SOCIAL SCIENCES

PUBLIC LIBRARY
MAR 2 1956
DETROIT

NATIONAL REVIEW

20 Cents

December 7, 1955

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

The Strange Case of Dr. Dooley

Articles and Reviews by . . . . WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM
JAMES BURNHAM · RUSSELL KIRK · JOHN CHAMBERLAIN
WILLMOORE KENDALL · DONALD DAVIDSON · W. T. COUCH

from WASHINGTON *straight*

A NEWSLETTER

SAM M. JONES

Who Craves Ave?

Big Labor is shopping for a winner. Some of the moguls are skeptical about Adlai Stevenson's appeal to the common man. They are not entirely sure that Adlai might not develop an independence contrary to the interests of the rulers of labor. He might have an attack of conscience. He might backslide. He might even venture to disagree with Walter Reuther. Such heresy is unlikely, but why take a chance? Intellectuals are notorious for their instability. Things might go badly for Adlai in 1956, as they did in 1952. Maybe "Honest Ave" is the better choice. No one ever accused him of being an intellectual. "Ave" has never been defeated at the polls. Big Labor will choose the Democratic Presidential nominee next year, but there isn't any hurry. Reuther and Beck—and the other big fry—are willing to be convinced.

Farmer in the Dell

Governor Fred Hall of Kansas is definitely a farm hope in GOP Presidential politics. A protégé of Alf M. Landon, Hall will receive consideration for a place on the national ticket, though Senator Carlson's consent must be had. Hall disagrees with Secretary Benson on what should be done for the farmer, but is otherwise a regular member of the Eisenhower team. Governor Hall thinks farm subsidies are at least as essential as the guaranteed annual wage. He takes a pragmatic view of political obligations and opportunities. His philosophy and his approach to farm problems are significant.

Farm Program

When Congress convenes in January there will be a number of farm "relief" bills introduced on both sides of the aisle in House and Senate. The Administration measure is now being drafted by the experts on the President's Advisory Committee on Agriculture. It is expected to ameliorate some of the provisions of the present law, especially the punitive sections applying to overproduction, but its prime purpose will be to provide incentive for quality rather than quantity production. Secretary Benson is still in the saddle but some of the features in the new farm bill represent a compromise. Unless the Administration presents an acceptable program, the Democrats will introduce one that has voter appeal, if nothing else, and capitalize accordingly. This is the compelling reason underlying the Administration's willingness to revise.

Ike at Gettysburg

To this historic ground, President Eisenhower summons Cabinet members and advisors. Dignitaries are bundled into helicopters and to the Presidential presence for conferences on this, that and the other. Geneva is tactfully unmentioned. But the big question in everyone's mind and on no official lips, is: "Well, Mr. President, do you or don't you, and if not you, who?"

It Could Be Tom

Thomas E. Dewey is still in the political picture despite his retirement from public service. Some Washington observers believe that Ike's decision in the matter of a "successor" will be firmly guided by Mr. Dewey.

The Power and the Glory

Observers here marvel at the arrogance of organized labor, whose most conspicuous piece of consumption recently has been the erection of a veritable palace on Capitol Plaza, where David Beck's teamsters' union can entertain and instruct captive Congressmen and bureaucrats. If any such edifice had been constructed by General Motors, they agree, the outcry against so insolently situated a monument to the power of vested interests would have been instantaneous—and effective.

Unfortunate Illness

For the second time, the Internal Security Subcommittee has called off at the last minute its scheduled New York hearings on Communist infiltration of the press. In each case the reason was Senator Eastland's illness. There is growing concern on Capitol Hill, not only over the Senator's health, but over his committee's resultant inactivity while the Hennings Committee is pounding away at the government security program.

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR and PUBLISHER: Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

EDITORS

James Burnham Willmoore Kendall

Suzanne La Follette

Jonathan Mitchell William S. Schlamm

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES and CONTRIBUTORS

L. Brent Bozell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbott Clark, Forrest Davis, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, Russell Kirk, Frank S. Meyer, Gerhart Niemeyer, E. Merrill Root, Morrie Ryskind, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

London: F. A. Voigt *Paris*: Eudocio Ravines

Taipei: John C. Caldwell

Vienna: Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn

Zurich: Wilhelm Roepke

BUSINESS MANAGER: Arthur W. D. Harris

ADVERTISING MANAGER: Theodore A. Driscoll

Contents DECEMBER 7, 1955 VOL. I, NO. 3

THE WEEK 3

ARTICLES

The Strange Case of Dr. Dooley 9

Presidential "Inability," II. 17

DEPARTMENTS

From Washington, Straight ..... Sam M. Jones 2

National Trends ..... L. Brent Bozell 8

The Third World War ..... James Burnham 16

The Resistance 19

Foreign Trends ..... W. S. 20

On the Left ..... C. B. R. 22

Labor ..... Jonathan Mitchell 23

The Liberal Line ..... Willmoore Kendall 24

From the Academy ..... Russell Kirk 25

Arts and Manners ..... William S. Schlamm 26

To the Editor 29

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Sex in the Desert ..... John Chamberlain 27

Book-Burning Whitewash ..... Donald Davidson 28

Established Precedent ..... William T. Couch 29

Simple Testimony ..... Karl Hess 29

Episodic Chapters ..... R. P. O. 30

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly at Orange, Conn. by National Weekly, Inc. Copyrighted 1955 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc. Application for acceptance as controlled circulation pending at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:
211 East 37 St.
New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone: MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES: Twenty cents a copy, $7.00 a year, $13.00 for two years. Foreign, $9.00 a year; Canada, $8.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

Post-Geneva Hangover

Geneva was a mistake, a trap and a failure. Therefore let us have more Genevas.

The Russian smiles were hollow. The Russians have not deviated a shadow's breadth from their march toward world conquest. Their talk about coexistence is only a cover for their blows. Therefore let us redouble our efforts to achieve coexistence with the Russians.

The reasoning is not easy to follow, but in their comments on the Geneva conference it seems to have been adopted by the President, his Secretary of State and the majority of our commentators, official and unofficial.

Secretary Dulles reported the following as the President's analysis of what happened at Geneva:

"I know that no setback, no obstacle to progress will ever deter this Government and our people from the great effort to establish a just and durable peace. Success may be long in coming, but there is no temporal force so capable of helping to achieve it as the strength, the might, the spirit of 165,000,000 free Americans. In striving toward this shining goal, this country will never admit defeat."

At a moment when our opponent, self-declared as a mortal enemy, boasting that the world triumph of his system will come within the present century, at this very moment when he is smashing our painfully built defenses to burst through into new regions marked for conquest, are these faded platitudes the kind of guidance that we are to get from the one who we are told from many sides is the indispensable leader not only of this country but of mankind?

Secretary Dulles, in his own address to the nation, did little more than fill in the platitudes with a long list of "on the one hand"s and "on the other"s. He assured us that in spite of all that has happened, the spirit of Geneva is not dead (Molotov's spirit or Dulles', one wonders), "our efforts at that conference" were not wasted, the chance for more conferences and more negotiations lies always ahead.

The Democrats Jump In

The aftermath of Geneva has put the Democrats in an exposed and awkward spot. By the record they have been more Genevan than the Genevans. Theirs were the loudest voices in singing the praise of coexistence, negotiation, mutual understanding. All through the coexistence honeymoon they were the

white champions of bipartisanship, and in those delicious days no sound of Democratic criticism of Administration foreign policy was heard abroad in the land.

When a motion was made in the Senate to attach a few realistic pre-conditions to our attendance at Geneva Conference No. One, the Summit meeting, there were at any rate four Republican votes in favor, but not a one from the Democratic bench.

Now, with a Republican Administration in office, our foreign policy has scored a reverberating flop. The occasion is too good for a hard-working politician to miss, no matter what the logic of the past or the truth about shared responsibility. First Adlai Stevenson at Chicago (rather timidly) and then Averell Harriman at Seattle (more recklessly) strove to turn the muddy refuse of Geneva into political hay.

The coin of their words rings false. They speak against a public background on which the figures of George Kennan and Dean Acheson are once more seen, rising from the mists to tell us, via essay and book, how foreign policy should be conducted. Do the architects of our retreat from victory feel that we are not falling back fast enough?

What besides deploring phrases about the fix we are in do Messrs. Stevenson and Harriman have to suggest? They say not a word about the axioms and premises—which were of course their own—on the basis of which we flew to the trap at Geneva. Their positive proposals are, as always, for more negotiations, billions more dollars spent with no idea of what it will bring, "moderation" (Stevenson) and, God save the mark, Harriman's ideological rabbit—the Democratic Party's "understanding of people . . . not only at home but around the world."

Let Secretary Dulles re-read his former comments on the need for "an agonizing reappraisal." The phrase was well and soberly chosen. Surely the time is at hand.

Low and Sweet

"The Voice of America," rejoiced the *New York Times* the other day, "will continue to speak to Russia in tones of reason and moderation despite failure of the Geneva Conference to establish better ground rules for contacts between the United States and Russia." This sentence, on first perusal, made us take a second look at the paper we were reading: did the bold statement that there *could* be better ground rules for contacts between the United States and Soviet Russia than "reason and moderation" indeed originate in the *New York Times?* A second look, however, persuaded us that, though the grammatical mistake was the *Times'*, the interpretive mistake was entirely ours: "better ground rules" referred not at all to reason and moderation but to—well, to the world in general. And thereby hangs a tale.

The tale, according to the *Times,* is that the Voice of America is no longer what it used to be. It has, specifically, "much changed from the shrill and angry spokesman it used to be." Now that *is* news—particularly to Congress, which allotted money for the Voice of America on the explicit assumption that it was going to be the kind of spokesman it no longer is. Nor would the excuse wash that the Voice of America has changed, dutifully, with the recent change of official U.S. policy. Though it might feel like ages, the Administration's surrealistic jump to the other side of the moon took place only a few months ago, at the Summit of Geneva. But, reports the *New York Times,* in the Voice of America *"for the last two years* [emphasis supplied] the keynote has been moderation," while in the days before, "almost anything went in the way of a verbal brickbat."

What happened *two years ago* to change that conduct? As far as we can remember, the only important thing that happened two years ago was the fatal American acquiescence in a stalemate in Korea. Does the *Times* mean to say that, in consequence of Korea, the State Department switched its propaganda line—*almost two years before Geneva?*

If so, Congress had better check up on what happened to its appropriations or, at any rate, to the arguments with which these appropriations were obtained. It should inquire, among other things, into the *Times'* revelation that "full reports have been broadcast of the warm and friendly reception given to Emil Gilells, the Soviet pianist, and to the tours of the United States by the Soviet agricultural and housing officials and journalists"—to seek an answer as to why the State Department should spend millions of dollars on—to say the very least—a superfluous amplification of what *Tass* and other Soviet agencies are fully reporting without help from U. S. taxpayers.

The Planners' Inflation

The unheralded increase last week by the Federal Reserve Board of the rediscount rate—to 2½ per cent—is a ghostly reminder of the planners' pat "solution" to the problem of inflation. It was the third increase this year; and there have been heaven only knows how many increases and decreases since 1945, calculated to maintain the economy at a "plateau" between depression and inflation, a do-it-yourself exercise for any planner who takes the time to read Lord Keynes' treatise on the General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money.

Only the federal government is equipped, any post-Keynesian economics textbook will tell you, to steer the economy away from the twin evils of inflation and depression. One has only to decrease public investment (spending), increase taxation and the rediscount rate when money and credit are abundant,

and do the reverse when money is scarce, and there you are. The experts call this compensatory, or countercyclical spending, in behalf of which they justify the accumulation of total economic power by the government.

Yet here we are, with credit inflation proceeding apace, with scattershot increases and decreases in the rediscount rate, and nothing appears to halt the slow but steady march of inflation—which is the result of government spending, unbalanced budgets, and the overextension of credit.

Defenders of Lord Keynes will tell us that the reason it isn't working out is that we lack the political courage to act as sternly against inflation as Keynes would have directed us to do. And indeed, the Swiss economist, Professor Wilhelm Roepke, has observed that in the history of civilization, "no statesman responsible for inflation has ever been the victim of bloody revenge." Not because the effects of inflation are less destructive than those of deflation —*vide* post-World War One Germany—but because the manifestations of this kind of economic disorder are not as explosively objectionable to the people as those of depression. A five-dollar hamburger is not as great a social irritant as joblessness. Professor Roepke goes further: the people resent *effective* anti-inflationary measures, just as, today, the people would look askance at taxation aimed at reducing the national debt, at a decrease in government subsidies, at a paring down of non-government defense expenditures.

The point is the planners have, as usual, failed to construct the ideal society, because they do not understand that there is no science of human action. The pathetic efforts of the government to halt inflation and enjoy it simultaneously will go on as, we must ruefully suppose, we continue to delegate to the government the job of manipulating an economy which will never smile on us until allowed to mature and grow strong through the non-nationalized operation of the price system.

After You, Gaston

Mr. Thomas E. Murray, one of the five members of the Atomic Energy Commission, has proposed that we convene an "Atomic Summit" meeting at Eniwetok island, "and there detonate a large thermonuclear weapon before an audience representative of all the peoples of the world." This audience would include observers from the Soviet Union, Communist China and the European satellite countries. The purpose of the performance would be to promote peace by explaining to the world the meaning of "the Nuclear Age into which we Americans have fortunately led the way."

Mr. Murray surrounded his proposal with a long and not entirely clear speech. We are, nevertheless, prepared to endorse it, with one modification. We think that the lesson will be more complete and convincing if there are two displays simultaneously staged, both of them before an audience from all nations: one, by us at Eniwetok, as Mr. Murray suggests; the other, by Moscow at *their* Eniwetok, wherever it may be.

Tens of thousands of persons of many nationalities have witnessed our nuclear tests. Tens of millions have seen authentic movies and photographs. Even official invited Soviet visitors (besides unofficial spies) have been present, as at the 1946 Bikini series.

But, as Dr. Medford Evans reminded us last week in his article, "The Atomic Disarmament Trap," no one, just no one, has come forward as a public witness of Soviet tests. Surely if the meaning of the Nuclear Age is to be clarified, it will be necessary to hear from the Soviet as well as from the American teacher.

"The Soviet Union," Dr. Evans commented justly, "has never made a habit of using the Iron Curtain to conceal accomplishments." Presumably, then, Moscow would be glad to accept an expanded Murray proposal for a dual display. If not, it might be well to examine more closely her reasons for reticence, before exhibiting to her representatives the details of our own accomplishments.

The Number One Cartel

The President's annual message to Congress is now in process of preparation. We hope that it will find place for a strong recommendation to speed the economic surgery that this Administration has promised, and has happily—though sporadically—begun. We refer to the purifying operation whereby a good Republican scalpel, well sharpened by American principle and tradition, has cut away from the body of the government some of those noxious economic growths that were so widely spread by the virus of the New Deal. We call, in short, for more action on the announced program "to take the government out of business."

There has already been, of course, some action: if much less and less swift than libertarians would desire, rather more than skeptics foretold. Under the Eisenhower Administration the government-owned synthetic rubber plants were sold to private corporations via free competitive bidding. The federal government has abandoned claims to tidelands oil, which is now being developed in the traditional American way, with the enormous expenses carried by private citizens risking their own money instead of by exactions from taxpayers. The record in electric power is mixed. The Dixon-Yates contract, badly handled and explained, was vulnerable to Liberal demagogues. But, in spite of a fierce attack from the public power lobby, the Administration stood firm on the Snake River dams, two

of which are now going ahead as free private constructions. The armed forces have been spinning off dozens of parasitic businesses, from restaurants to foundries.

Big Government enthusiasts use the slogan, "You can't turn the clock back!" as an adroit propaganda device for blocking efforts to eradicate the distortions that New Dealism imposed on our traditional system —distortions which in their cumulative effect can lead only toward the loss of liberty as of material well-being in the gray serf-state of socialism. By that slogan you can justify every bad law, every crime and war and tyranny in history. The slogan, moreover, is plainly false, as the present Administration has shown, up to a point, in practice.

The reports of the Hoover Commission, naming literally thousands of cases where the government is carrying out business functions for no justifiable economic or social reason, maps a wide field for applying the rule of getting government out of business. Every time that a government-run business is turned back to where it belongs—to the hands of free private citizens competing fairly with other free citizens—the nation benefits from more efficient performance, more equitable taxation, and from the promotion of those non-bureaucratic qualities of personal independence and self-reliance upon which rests the greatness of our country.

The UN and Private Property

Last week, a so-called "working party" of the Third Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which treats of matters Social, Cultural and Humanitarian, reported in with an attempted compromise. It was the job of this working party to come up with a sop for the very few nations which still believe in protecting privately owned foreign investments against arbitrary expropriation. There had been a reaction to a previous draft of the human rights group which morally licensed foreign governments to acquire, without ceremony or compensation, property owned by Citizens of the World. But the working party just couldn't bring itself to see anything particularly inviolate in private property, and the compromise solution promises to be no compromise at all.

The existing formulations assert, simply, that "The right of people to self-determination shall include permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources"—as facile a transition from a political right to an economic aggression as ever we saw. Another states that "in no case may a people be deprived of its own means of sustenance on the grounds of other rights that may be claimed by other states"—as ambiguous a formulation as any demagogue needs to invoke the Holy Writ of the United Nations to justify any old act of highwaymanry involving the property of foreigners.

In the scant ten years of its life, the UN has developed a more or less traditional attitude toward private property, whose existence, like that of God and Switzerland, it does not recognize. No enumeration of human rights that has got by any UN committee has listed the right to private property. (And not because such enumerations are abbreviated. One draft on human rights acknowledges some sixty-three rights, including the right to equal treatment for bastards.) In December of 1952, the right of nations to nationalize their natural resources, again with no mention of compensation, was upheld by a thumping majority—36-4 (U.S., England, South Africa and New Zealand). It was perhaps predictable that the effort to insinuate at least a halfhearted obeisance to the right of property into the human rights document would be unsuccessful.

The position of the United States has been difficult throughout this period. Until 1952, the United Nations had no particular reason to believe that its endorsement of nationalization would embarrass the United States. From 1938, when Mr. Roosevelt acquiesced in the wanton ill-treatment of American investors by the government of General Carranza in Mexico, to 1952, when Mr. Truman telegraphed Premier Mossadegh his "sympathy" with Iran's nationalization of British-owned oil refineries, our attitude has been one of pronounced submissiveness to foreign depredations on American investors. On the other hand, the United States has officially encouraged American capital to seek out profitable opportunities abroad.

And in the fall of 1952, Eisenhower promised that, if he was elected, the Covenant on Human Rights would not win Executive approval, and hence would never reach the Senate. This stand by Mr. Eisenhower practically decomposed our then representative on the Board of Human Rights, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; a price the Republicans were prepared to pay. But also it sharply curtailed the influence of her successor, Mrs. Oswald Lord, in her attempts to exert the influence of the United States to modify the covenant. What business is it of yours, her colleagues say in effect, if you are committed a priori to reject what we produce?

There are three lessons reinforced by our experience with this chapter of the United Nations' biography. The first is that we are living in a world overtly hostile to private property; with the result, second, that prodding by American officials to invest abroad, coupled with unctuous invitations from foreign governments, must ring hollow. Third, and most important: the United Nations, true to form, continues to address itself to problems over which it has no jurisdiction and whose relationship to the preservation of peace is, at the least, tenuous. Such intrusions on the privacy of member states tend to strengthen the impression that so many Americans

intuitively have of the United Nations as a meddlesome bureaucracy, dominated by statists who will settle only for the total colonization of the world.

Compassion for Dr. Hutchins

Though he is no longer a boy wonder, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins is still blessed with the charm of childish innocence or, anyhow, the advantages thereof. Each time we intend to be stern with him, a cinder of silly compassion hurts our eyes; and somehow we smile and forgive. For the trouble (not with Dr. Hutchins but with us) is that this child prodigy of forty years ago can still get himself into more pathetic situations than we can stand.

For instance, he appeared recently on "Meet the Press," a television show that eats celebrities alive. Nobody forced Dr. Hutchins to go, of course, but after a few minutes he cut such a pitiable figure that we could not help but wince. Dr. Hutchins, we hear, is a fiend at raising money and moral support from defenseless suburban ladies, but he certainly gave up and died in front of a few normally inquisitive journalists. Consider the following give-and-take (quoted verbatim from the official transcript of "Meet the Press"):

"SPIVAK: Do you believe that Communism has been and is now a serious danger to the country?

"HUTCHINS: Yes, I do.

"SPIVAK: Since Communism is apt to destroy our freedoms and our civil liberties and the Fund's interest is to protect those civil liberties, can you tell us what the Fund has done to fight Communism itself?

"HUTCHINS: . . . What the Fund has done about Communism is to commission Professor Rossiter of Cornell to make what we hope will be a definitive study of what Communism has amounted to in the United States and what it amounts to now."

But this was only the beginning of Dr. Hutchins' decline and our fall. A few minutes later Frederick Woltman, of the *New York World-Telegram and Sun,* asked a flustered Dr. Hutchins: "Dr. Hutchins, as a matter of fact you said a few weeks ago in New York that you would not hesitate to hire a present member of the Communist Party to work for the Fund, did you not?"

"HUTCHINS: The Fund for the Republic is committed to the proposition that Communism . . .

"WOLTMAN: "Will you answer the question?

"HUTCHINS: "I'm going to. The Fund for the Republic is committed to the proposition that Communism is a menace. The Fund for the Republic is also committed to individual liberty and individual rights. The Fund has condemned boycotting and blacklisting; it has insisted on due process and the equal protection of the laws. It has condemned guilt by association. The principle is that the individual stands on his own merits.

"WOLTMAN: Now, would you mind answering the question?

"HUTCHINS: This is a principle that was enunciated very often by the late Senator Robert A. Taft, therefore, what I was simply trying to do when I answered the question to which you refer was to dramatize the proposition that the individual must be judged on his individual merits.

"WOLTMAN: Would you also hire a Nazi or a Fascist or a Ku-Klux-Klanner?

"HUTCHINS: This question is a real flying saucer; so was the other one.

"WOLTMAN: Well, you didn't answer it.

"HUTCHINS: I beg your pardon, I did.

"WOLTMAN: You would also hire a Nazi. . .

"HUTCHINS: No, I didn't say I would.

"WOLTMAN: I am sorry, I thought you said you would hire a Communist.

"HUTCHINS: No, I said the great question always is what is the individual in himself. This is the American principle, therefore the question cannot be answered . . . "

Therefore, it is indeed difficult to be angry at Dr. Hutchins. It always hurts us more than him. But there is no point in beating around the bush.

A few minutes later Mr. Woltman asked:

"WOLTMAN: Well, would you still say whether you would knowingly hire a member of the Communist Party?

"HUTCHINS: This question cannot be answered in those terms.

"WOLTMAN: You were quoted in many newspapers throughout the country several weeks ago and made no denial.

"HUTCHINS: I saw that.

"WOLTMAN: Do you deny you said that?

"HUTCHINS: I do not regard the headlines an accurate description either of what I said or what I had in mind.

"WOLTMAN: And you made no challenge whatsoever of the New York *Times* and the New York *Herald Tribune,* press associations, *World-Telegram and Sun?*

"HUTCHINS: If I were to involve myself in commenting on all newspaper reports, I would have a great deal to do.

"WOLTMAN: Well, I heard you say it, for one."

And so on and so forth.

What disturbs us is that Mr. Hutchins' performance may prompt some members of his audience to indict, not the Fund for the Republic or the corporation that gave it birth, but the system of education of which Mr. Hutchins is a symbol. Does neoclassical education do *this* to you?, one can hear it said by parent after parent as they reach down and dust off their Dewey, Rugg, Kilpatrick and Counts.

NATIONAL TRENDS

L. BRENT BOZELL

Senator McCarthy plans to ask for a congressional investigation of the whole Geneva episode at the beginning of the January session. The Wisconsin Republican will contend that the Geneva debacle cannot be laid to "surprising Soviet tactics" or Mr. Molotov's "shocking attitude," or any other variant of the bad luck theme; he will maintain that the cause was gross incompetence in the Executive branch, which owes Congress a full explanation.

McCarthy, the only national figure to warn last summer of the pitfalls of top-level negotiations with the Kremlin (he said the U.S. was "cooperating in the Communist peace-offensive" by playing "the role of straight-man for the Soviet Union") and a vigorous critic of the "spirit of Geneva" ever since, is boiling—not because his own advice was ignored but because he has come across Communist Party documents that plainly and publicly disclosed, in advance, Communist purposes in calling for top-level negotiations, and set forth the tactics the Communists planned to use during the the negotiations. McCarthy's question: why were these documents paid less heed than Neville Chamberlain accorded *Mein Kampf*? He will argue that the U.S. taxpayer is put to quite an expense to maintain a huge intelligence agency, and a regiment of "experts on communism" in the Department of State—persons who are paid to know what the Communist line is, how to evaluate it and how it should be dealt with. Clearly, someone fumbled the ball on Geneva. If it turns out that faulty advice was given by the "professionals," the Senator's position will be that some of those very expert heads should roll, and that the Department should hire replacements who made better guesses about Geneva. If the correct evaluation *was* passed on to the top, we may need a new Secretary—or, if the blame lodges there, a different National Security Council.

McCarthy holds that in foreign policy matters, as well as in others, the Executive branch is accountable to Congress for mismanagement of the nation's affairs. Even with our Constitution's fixed election schedule, the Senator argues, it is possible to enforce some degree of Executive responsibility. He maintains that if the Executive fails to consult Congress on its own motion, Congress has no alternative but to invoke its supervisory powers, and with the aid of the subpoena, conduct an "investigation."

Plans for a Conservative coalition campaign for the Republican nomination, reported earlier in this column, are encountering the anticipated obstacles. The key man at the moment—due to the early date of the New Hampshire primary—is Styles Bridges. Senator Bridges, as of three weeks ago, had definitely decided to run as a favorite son, if the President takes himself out of the race. Every sign indicates the Senator feels the same way today.

But what if Mr. Eisenhower hasn't disclosed his intentions by the time primary-day rolls around? There's the rub for all of the coalition partners.

Right-wing organization leaders are trying to counter the candidates' timidity by assuring them there is not the remotest chance the President will run, although he may postpone a public declaration. They cite the fact that Milton Eisenhower and Paul Hoffman campaign buttons are showing up everywhere, something that neither man, especially the President's brother, would be likely to permit if Ike's plans were still in doubt.

GOP Liberals are looking for a pro-Eisenhower candidate to enter the Midwest primaries in the event the Conservative coalition decides to strike out for the nomination. Among those under consideration is Governor Fred Hall of Kansas. Last week in New York, Governor Hall began his bid in earnest by reading out of the party all Republicans who are "out of step" with President Eisenhower and his "philosophy." The choice, he said, "is not between a conservative philosophy and a progressive philosophy, but between a progressive philosophy and something far more radical."

None of this, however, is likely to win for Hall the White House support he so ardently covets. Unfortunately for the Governor, there are few persons closer to the High Command than Senator Carlson of Kansas, an arch-foe of Hall's in the home state. Hall got his governor's job over the opposition of Carlson, and Carlson is out to prove who is really who. The Senator is confident that the yeomanly chores he has been doing for the Administration will pay dividends.

Adlai Stevenson may now be the front-runner among the Democrats, but many organization men are laying different plans. The politicians, more and more, doubt Stevenson's capacity to dramatize the issues that the Democratic leadership wants to bear down on hard. After three years of "studying the causes of my failure," he is the same old Adlai, a talented quipster whose main intellectual preoccupation is with pointing out how many variables have to be weighed in making a decision.

No doubt about it, Stevenson is still a master of repartee. Yet he retains the habit of being unclear when he discusses *issues*, specifically his views about them. (For example: "Q. Governor, if there is a budget surplus next year, would you use the money to reduce taxes or deduct the national debt. A. I would certainly have to assess on the one hand the threat of inflation which would be an occasion for maintaining taxes; on the other hand, the needs, be it for schools, be it highways, be it hospitals, be it soil conservation, or what not, against the desirability of giving business a stimulant and the taxpayer a break. I don't see how I can foretell any of those things . . . You have to also assess the current needs as they increase or change or alter . . . You continue to determine whether your needs for expenditures are greater than your needs for tax potential, for a tax reduction . . ." And anyway, there are two sides to *every* question.)

Party leaders are wondering whether Mr. Stevenson will be equally circumspect when he gets around to things like labor legislation. Politicians tend to be impatient with a man who feels he must qualify every comma, much as they appreciate this trait as the mark of an intellectual giant.

The Strange Case of Dr. Dooley

I. Facts

A remark a few weeks ago by a nine-year-old boy to his mother touched off the strange case of Dr. Dooley. Admonished to stay away from a disreputable neighbor, the boy asked his mother, "Why don't you like him? Is he a pig like Dr. Dooley?"

Such a remark about one of the leading pediatricians and citizens of northwest Connecticut was surprising to say the least. Particularly so coming from a child, as Dr. James Parker Dooley was widely known as a friend and benefactor of children.

The ensuing investigation and the reaction to it in the region bared a microcosm of philosophical and moral ferment which, incredibly, went unnoticed in the national press. Believing that the episode has an urgent meaning for our society, the editors have chosen to treat extensively of the strange case of Dr. Dooley.

According to available records, James Milton Parker Dooley was born in Bloomington, Illinois, on December 10, 1902. He was educated in local schools and graduated from Illinois Wesleyan College in 1923. From there he went to the medical school of Johns Hopkins University, where he won his Phi Beta Kappa key. After three years he was sent to Labrador for a year's special work in surgery. The next year, 1927, Parker Dooley received his medical degree and was granted an outstanding two-year resident appointment to the surgical staff at Johns Hopkins Hospital.

In 1929, just as the young Dr. Dooley was completing the second year of this appointment, a request came to Johns Hopkins from Father Frederick H. Sill, an Episcopalian minister who for many years was headmaster of Kent School, the well-known preparatory school located on the bank of the Housatonic River across from the village of Kent in northwestern Connecticut. Father Sill asked Johns Hopkins to name a panel to investigate a number of unexplained deaths among the students. This was done, and one recommendation of the panel was the appointment of a school physician. The assignment was proposed to Dr. Dooley, who accepted "because it offered an opportunity for some original research and would also provide some money to pay off some of his accumulated debts."

Dr. Dooley stayed at Kent School for five years, from 1929 to 1934, where, along with his duties as resident physician, he conducted biological research into streptococci and undulant fever that received national notice in medical circles. This brought him, in 1934, a full-time teaching appointment at Cornell Medical School in New York. He also was made chief of the outpatient clinic of New York Hospital, which is affiliated with the Cornell Medical School. Dr. Dooley has stated that, during this period, in order to continue active work with patients he turned down an offer from Mayor La Guardia to become administrative head of all New York City hospitals.

In 1939 Dr. Dooley transferred to the faculty of the Pediatrics Department at the University of Chicago. He became one of the leading figures there and at the famous Bob Roberts Hospital for children. After the war, for a while, he moved his laboratory down to his old college (Illinois Wesleyan), where he found time to teach a course in Latin American history.

He had long wanted to study tropical agriculture. In 1946 the government of Haiti invited him to go into one of its primitive villages to try out public health methods. Dr. Dooley accepted this offer. In the mid-summer of 1946 he arrived in New York on his way to Haiti, but found no ships immediately available. To escape the city's heat while waiting for a ship, he went back to Kent.

About four miles from Kent village, a descendant of an old New England family, Miss Myra Hobson, a spinster in her seventies, lives by herself on a now inactive family farm comprising 1,200 acres of pasture and woods that stretch across the foothills of the Berkshires. In the middle of her property, deep in the trees and half a mile from the road, there is a small lake, or pond. On the shore of the pond there is a rough wood cabin, such as fishermen or hunters are wont to use. This cabin, by modern standards, is unadorned: there is no running water, no electricity, no furnace, no telephone.

Parker Dooley settled in this cabin, in the cool woods, while waiting for his ship. But he broke his leg, and had to give up his journey and his assignment. While his leg mended, it became known that he was there. Cases were brought to him. His months in the cabin multiplied, and soon he joined a small medical clinic that functioned in the village. His work expanded throughout the neighboring communities: Sharon, Salisbury, Lakeville, Washington, Warren, Cornwall, Falls Village and even farther afield.

Dr. Dooley maintained an office, along with three other doctors, at the Kent village clinic, although his name did not appear on the door. His practice grew to comprise, it is said, 2,500 children. He became school physician at the local public school. When a Health Center, devoted to children's problems and supported by contributions from the leading families of the region, was started at Salisbury, Dr. Dooley became the leading professional figure. He often spoke at meetings of Parent-Teacher associations and before other community organizations.

Dr. Dooley continued to live in the woodland cabin, and the cabin continued as it was. Without a telephone, messages had to be brought to him. He had no car, and through sun or rain or snow he walked the four miles to the village, unless his landlady, her sister or one of his other friends happened to drive him in. His life was spare and frugal. Though his practice was large enough to have brought him a considerable income, his fees were small—indeed, bills were often overlooked altogether.

Dr. Dooley stayed for nine years in his cabin.

Not long after he settled there, Dr. Dooley initiated a long-term special project. He became acquainted with the plight of certain children, ranging from nine to sixteen or seventeen years in age, who from one cause or another had come to be regarded as gravely delinquent, unmanageable or intractable. These cases often came to light through courts, hospitals or other public institutions (not all in Connecticut), sometimes through physicians, clergymen or relatives. Dr. Dooley determined to handle some of these cases by having the children take up lengthy residence under his direct supervision in the cabin. In all, under what came to be known as "the cabin project," twenty-two children stayed there, for from two to four years. Some of them stayed in the neighborhood a year or two longer, still under Dr. Dooley's care, but living in the foster-homes of parents who admired and believed in Dr. Dooley's work. This cabin project became well known, not only in the region but widely through New York and New England. The boys shared the rough life of the woods. They chopped kindling, hauled the water from the hand pump, slept in sleeping bags on the floor. They walked more than a mile through the trees and down the road to board the morning bus for the local elementary school or the regional high school at Falls Village. The disorders of many of the twenty-two were lessened under Dr. Dooley's care; and it is generally believed that in some cases the improvement was outstanding.

In March of this year, the cabin received through the Salisbury Health Center a strange and moving case. The subject was a ten-year-old boy, who will be called "George." George, though good looking and seemingly intelligent, suffered from a derangement that impelled him to emit periodically—without any volition and almost without awareness of it—a piercing, anguished bark, or howl. The medical term for this affliction is "lycanthropy." It was well known, though differently explained, in ancient and medieval times, when it led to the tales of werewolves howling in the night.

The trouble had not been lessened by any previous treatments. It was so severe, and so agonizing to others who heard it, that George was unable to attend school, go to movies or join in any social activities. When Dr. Dooley accepted the boy as a cabin patient, he told his mother it would be best if the family stayed away. The mother, distressed and baffled by the child's strange malady, readily assented.

George had a number of brothers. Dr. Dooley suggested that two of them —Peter, aged 13 and Mark, 9—should visit at the cabin, since, he said, their histories were relevant to his study of George's illness. Peter came for some days, and Mark was there during the week from August 1 to August 7.

When Mark first came home he said little about his visit, but a few days later, when his mother had occasion to scold him and to tell him to stay away from a neighbor of whom she disapproved, the child asked:

"Why don't you like him? Is he a pig like Dr. Dooley?"

This totally unexpected question led the mother to make immediate inquiries, the results of which she quickly turned over to the State Police. On August 14 the police, on the basis of direct evidence of active homosexual encounters between Dr. Dooley and the cabin patient, George, as well as the two brothers during their visits, drove up the dirt road to the cabin and arrested Dr. Dooley for "indecent assault and risk of injury to a child."

Dr. Dooley, pending trial, was placed in the jail at Litchfield, the county seat. He made no attempt to raise the $7,500 bail, though he could easily have done so. He did not deny the acts which formed the basis of the arraignment, but entered a plea of *nolo contendere* —that is, waiving jury trial, he placed himself at the disposal of the Court.

On October 4, Judge Elmer W. Ryan, sitting in the Superior Court at Litchfield, heard the case, with Thomas F. Wall appearing for the State and Charles R. Ebersol representing the defendant. Judge Ryan also accepted a lengthy statement prepared by the defendant, together with a large number of affidavits, letters and other documents.

On the next day, October 5, Judge Ryan gave his verdict. He rejected what Mr. Ebersol had held to be explanatory and mitigating circumstances, on the basis of which he had asked for the defendant's acquittal. On the evidence and admissions, Judge Ryan was convinced that Dr. Dooley "is a sex pervert . . . the aggressor in these acts." He found him guilty on two counts of the indictment. Under the laws of Connecticut, Judge Ryan sentenced Dr. Dooley to from one to six years in the State Prison. James Parker Dooley is now serving his sentence, at Wethersfield Penitentiary.

II. Opinions

Here, it would seem, the case of Dr. Dooley is at an end. The story, though odd—even fantastic, in some of its details—is sadly routine in pattern. A man transgresses the law. The transgression is discovered and confirmed. He is punished, in accordance with the law. When Judge Ryan spoke his verdict, the case was closed. Such is, usually and normally, society's view; and such was in fact the view of the greater number of the ordinary citizens of that Connecticut region—the farmers, artisans, merchants, laborers and some part of the teachers, lawyers, writers, artists and the wealthy who are scattered here and there through the hills.

But this was not the end, nor has the case yet ended.

On the day of the trial, the bare room in which the Court sat, open to the public, as demanded by Anglo-Saxon legal tradition even for such a case as this, was filled with spectators. These were not the farmers, artisans, merchants and laborers; nor, except for a marginal few, were they mere idlers. More than fifty of them, well dressed and assured in manner, were a selection of the region's intellectual elite. Most of them were women, the women recognized as community leaders, who head charity drives, belong to clubs, run the Parent-Teacher Association, the Association for the United Nations, the League of Women Voters. Almost without exception they were Liberals, by their own classification—though of course many who think of themselves as Liberals were not there, and would not have agreed with those who were.

These spectators, or nearly all of them, came to the courtroom to signify in a kind of public demonstration their sympathy with, their support of Doctor Dooley, their rejection of the judgment the Court inexorably must hand down. They were in agreement, and many of them continue to be in

agreement, with Dr. Dooley's explanation and views as these were expressed by his attorney, Mr. Ebersol.

What, then, was the explanation offered for these admitted actions which, *prima facie*, were subject to a triple condemnation: intrinsically, in and of themselves; as an adult's violation of children; as a physician's violation of his sacred Hippocratic oath?

Mr. Ebersol did not deny the homosexual encounters, nor did he contend that they had been limited to the three boys or the specific occasion specified in the legal charges. He made it clear that there had been other patients and other occasions. And in that open courtroom, within the hearing of those spectators, Mr. Ebersol, corrected occasionally by the defendant and plainly following the defendant's information and instruction, reviewed certain of the encounters with a specificity of detail not often found outside of medical textbooks. Against this factual background, Mr. Ebersol offered as defense his analysis of Dr. Dooley's purpose, end, and motives. In sum, Mr. Ebersol, for Dr. Dooley, contended that these encounters were an integral part of a new, pioneer and revolutionary technique of psychiatric therapy.

On October 6, the day after the sentencing, the *Lakeville Journal*, the most influential newspaper of the region, published a letter from Dr. Dooley:

"To the Editor:

"I have not been a reader of the *Lakeville Journal* nor do I know your name. Some one sent me a clipping from the August 18 (?) issue of your paper, telling of my arrest and imprisonment. This account was so sympathetic that I thought you might be willing to publish a statement from me about my work at Kent.

"The work in question was a project for the study of disturbed and sick children in residence in a woods cabin on a lake, part of an old farm four miles from the village. During nine years, twenty-two children stayed there for long periods; and many more, for a short time. This project was separate from my clinical pediatric practice in the village.

"The people in this locality grew accustomed to seeing derelict children become respectable junior citizens of the community. The methods used to

accomplish these results were always experimental and unorthodox, and occasionally illegal.

"The first two children in this study were from the middle west, and were placed in my care because their parents were familiar with my work in Chicago. With no exception, each subsequent child came because the parents or some agency had first hand knowledge of the results in the case of some child who had been at the cabin.

"In the management of disturbed children many general approaches have been used, among them: force, admonition, kindness, and traditional psychiatric medicine. None of these has been so successful that a further search for methods is not indicated.

"In this project, the approach was to induce the child to go back in his life to the age when his trouble started, and then to guide him anew up to his present age along lines which would be more comforting to him and more acceptable to others. Some observers thought that the children progressed because I was so nice and the woods so pretty. Actually, accompanying a child in a deep regression may be a raw and bloody business, not a trip for the squeamish.

"Naturally I don't enjoy losing my freedom, but the fact remains that I knew the law, and knowingly violated it. That the methods used on occasion may have been technically illegal does not invalidate the soundness of the results.

[Signed] PARKER DOOLEY
9/23/55

"Ed. Note: This letter was received prior to the arraignment reported elsewhere in this paper. At the doctor's request it was withheld until after the trial."

The core of the defense was contained in Mr. Ebersol's review of the case of Robert,[1] another of the cabin patients, now sixteen, whose experience at the hands of Dr. Dooley he related as illustrative.

"BY MR. EBERSOL: Mr. Wall [State's attorney] has referred to the case of another child, a sixteen-year-old boy; and I shall refer to him as Robert. A homeless ward of the State, no usable family, he came to the cabin on Thanksgiving Eve, 1952. He was still there when the Doctor was arrested. He came on the request of the juvenile court. From that day on, except for a rare day when he visited elsewhere, and for three or four weeks in this summer, the Doctor spent some part of every one of approximately one thousand days with him; and for many weeks of those days, early in his stay, he was never out of the Doctor's hearing. Upon his arrival, about all the Doctor knew of his history was his unusual record of eight runaways from foster homes and institutions. Only several months later, after repeated requests, did the Doctor obtain from the Division of Child Welfare of the State Department of Welfare a social summary of the information on the boy.

"The Doctor then learned, for the first time, that he was an illegitimate child, and that in addition to his chronic runaways, there was chronic thievery, chronic lying and deception, chronic truancy from school and chronic school failures, and chronic sex offenses.

"Quoting from the State report which the Doctor got several months later, 1951: 'A report from the director of the county home revealed that he displayed homosexual behavior at the County Home to the extent that he became ostracized from his own age group. In April, 1952, he was in trouble

[1]All the names of patients are, of course, disguised.

again; and the juvenile court authorities advised his [social case] worker that he was taking a short cut through some fields in his neighborhood on his way home from school and, upon encountering two younger boys, he took ten cents and a jacknife away from them. He then made homosexual advances to the other children, but the juvenile court took no action on this." End of quote.

"Here, then, was a radically, desperately sick boy with whom the agencies, the State and the court, did not know what to do.

"THE COURT: How old was that boy?

"BY THE ACCUSED DOOLEY: Thirteen years and five months.

"BY MR. EBERSOL: Thirteen years and five months, Your Honor. This was the situation when, three runaways later, he was brought from the juvenile detention home in Hartford to Dr. Dooley at the request of the juvenile court. A radical case requiring radical, unorthodox and experimental treatment when all else had failed. As a psychologist wrote of Robert, 'Robert needed someone to love him' and that the Doctor did, being father, mother, brother, or whatever and whenever the boy needed him.

"Here, again, I wish the Court might be able to read the Doctor's detailed report on Robert's regression and progression. Particularly upon his arrival and in his early stage, he needed and benefited by the permissive environment in developing a sense of assurance, trust, and belonging to someone. One by one, although in no planned order or at any one time, each of his chronic symptoms had to be dealt with down through his regression and up through his rebuilding. The sexual deviations were only one of these but, since we seem most concerned with them here, they will receive more attention now. Here let me emphasize, however, that by no means did all the cabin boys have sexual problems nor were sexual solutions the solutions to other problems that were there.

"It was clear, then, that Robert was schooled in homosexual intercourse of every kind before he came to the cabin. In permitting himself to become involved in Robert's sexual acts, the Doctor did not seduce him but only changed his attitude towards a preexisting situation. As the Doctor prefers to say, he took the badness out of the act and left the act hanging there, neither bad nor good.

"Doing this might be very unwholesome for the child if the Doctor's purpose was, as we claim, to satisfy—was, as the State claims, to satisfy his own lust. If, however, his purpose was, as we claim, to guide the child out of sex perversion to a more socially acceptable sexuality, then the successful spiritualization of his homosexual acts may be a wisely chosen first step; and in judging the Doctor's work, it would be well to remember that some very well-intentioned and energetic people had failed him when he was younger, when he was easier to work with. This morning, I received from the Doctor the last few pages of his case report on this boy.

"And I would like to read, just briefly, from them. 'That this boy was moving toward a homosexual way of life with me is simply not true. He was being freed of infantile needs, folding up and packing away his late-discovered and now tenderly completed infancy. He was not learning homosexuality. He was most certainly unlearning homosexuality.'

"As for results, it has been reliably reported to us that a psychiatrist, examining Robert after the Doctor's arrest, found him to be a well-integrated boy, and could not, after reading the report on him, written before his going to the cabin, believe that he was, in fact, the very same boy he was examining.

"This, then, very briefly, is the background of the cabin project, the laboratory for the study of children by an experienced, serious student.

"THE COURT: May I interrupt to inquire—?

"BY MR. EBERSOL: Yes.

"THE COURT: Is there a claim that this form of therapy has taken Robert out of the class of homosexuals?

"BY MR. EBERSOL: I don't believe it has been completed, yet, Your Honor. Doctor had not had an opportunity—I believe that he felt he had at least another year's work on Robert.

"THE COURT: Very well.

"BY THE ACCUSED DOOLEY: Less than a year.

"BY MR. EBERSOL: Less than a year, the Doctor says. I have been attempting, here, to give the Court the whole picture in outline form into which must be integrated the acts which formed the basis for the information against him.

"These acts are condemned and prohibited by law as indecent, unchaste, impure, obscene. This, the Doctor knew and understood when he engaged in them; but it appears to me, the motive and intent of the actor may and does change the whole character of the act and its consequences. Killing on the battlefield is sanctioned in wartime; and, often, the killer is rewarded with medals while killing in peacetime is murder, punishable by death."

The homosexual encounters with George's brothers, Peter and Mark, were also explained by therapeutic theory. It was necessary "to invite the relatives in and to associate them with the child in varying combinations and

situations which were calculated to show the structure of the relationship. . . . Although Peter, thirteen, did not appear to upset George, he threw some light on George's case. . . . He began coming to the cabin whenever possible. . . . All this time, the Doctor was carefully studying him and his relationship to George. . . . He was, then, convinced that Peter could not have heard of George's [homosexual] experience with the Doctor before Peter had almost exactly a similar one with the Doctor. That is, it was not the Doctor being the aggressor, but the permissive environment; and the boy taking the initiative. After that, further acts of this nature with Peter had only—were only in continuance and furtherance of this study."

As for the younger brother: "It was of importance for the Doctor to learn whether or not Mark had had any of

this experience because he felt that George's yelp had a sex-guilt expression—or had been a sex-guilt expression, and that this sex-guilt was pretty well now gone as far as George was concerned. So that this perfect younger brother, Mark, was just the one who would make George feel most guilty if he were in the habit of sex play with him, and then the symptoms might return. As Mark was such a snuggling child with the Doctor and so demonstrative physically, it was easy for the Doctor to learn whether he had the same desire for genital play as his two older brothers had shown. It . . . [became] quite clear to the Doctor that he had not."

Mr. Ebersol added: "Here, I do not wish to imply that all the sexual acts of the Doctor with the boys, on his part, were merely permissive; but I do assert that they were all engaged in by him with the same purpose in mind."

Mr. Ebersol read into the record a series of letters and affidavits that had been written in support of Doctor Dooley and of his unorthodox therapeutic methods. Excerpts from some of them follow.

A former patient wrote from Cambridge, Massachusetts: "I consider it a great fortune to know and to have been served by a doctor who would risk so much for his patient. Few men would go so far."

A master in a private school wrote: "We . . . are desperately sorry that your wonderful work has had to be interrupted. . . . Our belief in your personal integrity has not been changed. We realize that your medical skill and knowledge caused you to take steps not readily understood by a layman."

The President of a Massachusetts Parent-Teacher Association wrote: "It appears to us that you are suffering the penalty that often lands on forerunners, both in science or art. The threat of popular disapproval or of law infringement is set up to warn off the fainthearted or the criminal . . . So, in the doghouse or the jailhouse we find the best and the most mixed-up together or, rather, to use a less harsh term, the most creative and the most destructive. . . . In a sense both are threats to stable status quo society; and yet the first group are the seeds of tomorrow's best harvests.

". . . The size and character of your practice is evidence enough that your ways are sound and practical. No doubt it would be easy to find points where your methods carried you across the frontiers of the legal or the moral codes and made you vulnerable to accusations like the present ones; but we do not see that such pin-point out-of-context challenges have any validity. They may be true, but, lacking the whole truth, they are a kind of lie about you and your purposes."

Mr. Ebersol's culminating affidavit was written by one whom he describes as "an outstanding authority in the field of child guidance and family life who, with her husband, both psychologists, have conducted a school for disturbed children for more than twenty years. These people are in Court, here, today, Your Honor." Before they transferred their educational work to a rural environment, this couple, whose name is, as Mr. Ebersol notes, well known, for some years conducted a prominent school for normal younger children in New York City. The following are excerpts from the letter:

"It would seem to me that he had every professional and human urgency to do exactly as he did and I could wish that he would fight for that right. Perhaps I can make myself clearer with a simple example. Two men may cut open a woman's stomach. The one, Jack, the Ripper, commits a criminal act of assault. The other, Dr. John Doe, Surgeon, performs a life-saving miracle. Both men have performed, essentially, the same act. The intent of one is sadistic. The intent of the other is life-saving and knowledge-seeking for the purpose of further life-saving. The result of one is death; the result of the other is a chance for life. Are both these men to be regarded in the same light?

"Must the surgeon when attacked by ignorant, if well-meaning persons, plead guilty to assault along with Jack the Ripper[1]; and, if he does, does this not help to identify his act, in the public mind, with that of Jack?

"The Law necessarily follows, rather than precedes human experience. But if scientific exploration ceases until legal processes catch up, where would human progress be? History has presented us, again and again with the dilemma of brave men of insight and vision who have elected to proceed at whatever personal cost with the task of blazing new trails. . . .

"One could hardly imagine that the seriously disturbed children brought to Dr. Dooley, the so-called hopeless cases, could respond to anything or any person external to him. To use psycholingo, their transference was to him. It seems obvious that these youngsters had to work through their anxiety in the acquiescence and acceptance of his own person.

"Knowing what small amount I do about children, it seems to me that Dr. Dooley did an enlightened act of professional and personal giving of himself that could be conjectured to have made cure possible for these children...

"Scientifically he has given us clues to understanding children and the deep roots of their disturbances that few other scientists have even dared to look at, let alone expose.

"I feel that my own knowledge of children and effectiveness to them in time of trouble has been vastly increased by these observations."

One of Dr. Dooley's physician-colleagues at the clinic had given Mr. Ebersol his "Credo on the doctor." The colleague was in Court, and with his permission, Mr. Ebersol read from this Credo:

". . . He has always been known as a fearless pioneer in new fields. He has never sought favor, wealth or self-aggrandizement. He is primarily interested in fundamental biological processes . . .

"His actions, as described by himself, represent the exploration of little known problems with equally little known techniques. The problems were unorthodox; the approach equally so. To assume that he allowed himself to indulge in self-gratification ignores a completely selfless past and loses sight of the incredible amount of time and energy devoted to maintaining, feeding and teaching the boys under his care. This was a twenty-four-hour, seven-day job without interruption. This was the work of an exceptionally devoted man, for a man with very unusual singleness of purpose.

"There is no doubt in my mind, speaking as a physician, but that Dr. Dooley's actions represent an extension of scientific research into the sexual problems of adolescents. I am not competent to judge as to the value of what he accomplished with them or

[1]In quotations from the Court record, the exact style of the Court stenographer is followed.

discovered. I have no doubt as to his motive."

Judge Ryan's verdict did not close the issue in the minds of Dr. Dooley's firmer adherents. In a public letter, Dr. Dooley's nine-year landlady declared her full confidence in him and his work: "The cabin provided a place for his work and I have been close enough to be acquainted with many of the problems of the children, and to observe the day to day progress of these patients. . . . You may rest assured that the innate integrity that is Dr. Dooley's has in no way been impaired; rather has it been all the more demonstrated. . . . The treatments used surely in time shall be considered justified by the results achieved. . . . It is my fervent hope that in time he may return to the cabin on the mountain."

The *Lakeville Journal*, which had on the sixth published the report of the trial and the text of Dr. Dooley's letter, followed up on the thirteenth by giving over a large part of its editorial page to letters on the case. One of these, the shortest, is a plain, flat condemnation expressing surprise "that a publication as respectable as the *Lakeville Journal* condones a practice as vile as sex perversion especially by a pediatric physician." All the others are pro-Dooley, with the exception of one letter from a physician which suggests that Dr. Dooley could himself be helped by psychiatric treatment.

Dr. Paul W. Stoddard, Principal of the large Housatonic Regional High School, wrote: "Some time ago I offered to testify on Dr. Dooley's behalf at the trial, but the offer was refused by his lawyer, who, however, included a statement on our behalf in his plea to the Court.

"This case is without question one of the most confusing that I have ever known. . . . As one grows older, the more he is convinced that seldom is black all black or white all white, but that the pervading color in this world is some shade of gray! . . . I cannot defend Dr. Dooley for the particular acts that brought about his arrest and imprisonment because I do not know all the facts. . . . The Regional High School has been the richer that Dr. Dooley lived among us."

Another letter, signed by both man and wife, ended: "If he becomes free to practice again, we and our children will continue to be his patients. . . . The prosecutor demanded that he be made to pay heavily his 'debt to society.' In truth, a far heavier debt is society's to those very few of its servants who, living entirely in the present, spend *themselves* with no heed to the cost, burning their bridges *before* them."

One man wrote to accuse the prosecutor of "sensationalism." "As to Dr. Dooley's 'illegal method' in the case of the ten-year-old boy," he commented, "only the very cold fact by itself was the matter of the accusation leaving completely out the spirit in which it was done."

Another writer made an almost inevitable comparison: "Personally, I not only do not agree with [Judge Ryan's] decision, but feel that it is a very unfortunate one. It subjects a truly great, pioneering physician to a grave ordeal. . . . It makes one feel that society has not gone too many steps forward since the trials of Giordano Bruno, if a physician, using unorthodox methods in his studies to help mankind, can be incarcerated for doing so."

III. Judgment

There *are* innumerable shades of gray, yet black is black, not gray, and white is white, and the assertion that because gray exists black does not is philosophically ignorant and morally irresponsible. To say that because Bruno should not have been burned at the stake Parker Dooley should not have been imprisoned and disgraced is to fail to make distinctions as basic as those upon which it is necessary to rely to assert the difference between the unfolding world of scientific inquiry and the unchanging world of moral absolutes.

The case of Dr. James Parker Dooley is not confusing; it is Dr. Dooley's well-wishers who are confused. And their confusion is so great, and so serious, and so endemic, that we must look after our moral skins.

The form of argument used in defense of Dr. Dooley is identical to other arguments that have become famous in our day. It is the argument that rests on the instrumental conception of man as a mechanical bundle of conditioned reflexes, and on the metaphysical doctrine that the end justifies any means. Modern ideologues have explicitly relied on these doctrines, most glaringly when Lenin contended that "better two thirds of mankind perish than socialism fail." Stalin put this more colloquially, in justifying his reign of terror, when he reminded us that "you can't make an omelet without breaking eggs."

Indeed, as one of the doctor's sympathizers observes, the law follows, rather than precedes human experience. The law is the formalization of convention, and there is a convention-in-the-making, at least among substantial numbers of men and women of substantial education and means in the Housatonic Valley and, one must suppose under the circumstances, throughout the country. These men and women are, however, rather the passive victims than the makers of ideas. From their schooldays on they have been fed the rich diet of modern "scientism" under the fashionable brands of Dewey, Freud and Marx as sold on the market by the Max Lerners and the Albert Lynds. They have been taught that "scientific progress" is the purpose of human existence, and that all measures contributing to Science and Progress are justified. In accepting Dr. Dooley's scientific therapy, they are only applying, in all innocence, the principles of their masters.

In this they show themselves more honest if more indiscreet than the nation's public spokesmen for the views which they have absorbed. These spokesmen will continue to greet the Dooley case as they so far have, with a deeply embarrassed silence, or will shy away from it with protests of horror. But we cannot grant them the moral luxury of either silence or protest. Those who believe that scientific

Last Week's Puzzle

Here is the solution to "Exam Time." Henry got one mark in French. Of a total of 75 marks, Arthur received 24 (5, 5, 5, 5, 4). Therefore the only possible totals for the others were: Henry, 15; Stephen, 13; Richard, 12; and Oliver, 11 (5, 3, 1, 1, 1).

Assuming Henry received 5 in French, Arthur would receive 4. Stephen's marks must have been 3, 3, 3, 3, 1, with the 1 being in Philosophy (Oliver scored 3). Therefore, in French, Stephen received 3. Richard must have scored 4, 2, 2, 2, 2 (since all 3's and 4 1's are accounted for). Thus Richard received 2 in French, and it follows that Henry received 1.

progress is not subject to the restraints of traditional morality cannot at their convenience, for reasons of sentimentality, taste or tactical usefulness, draw back from the consequences of such a position. Dr. Dooley's ingenious and powerful defense is an unavoidable deduction from their own principles.

These principles accept a total experimental attitude toward the human personality provided only a) the experiment works, and b) the person conducting the experiment is motivated by a concern for the "welfare" of the object upon which the experiment is made. That is what the arguments in behalf of Dr. Dooley reduce to, plain and simple.

To be sure, the judge ruled that in point of fact, Dr. Dooley was gratifying his unnatural desires. He arrived at this decision after ruling implausible the explanation advanced as to why in order to cure George, who was sick, it had been necessary to violate Peter and Mark, who were whole. Dr. Dooley's defenders dismissed the judge's ruling on the matter as a further reflection of the incompetence of the layman to adjudicate matters involving "brave men of insight and vision who have been elected to proceed at whatever personal cost with the task of blazing new trails," and thus satisfied themselves as to Dr. Dooley's motives.

What if Dr. Dooley had been demonstrably out to satisfy his own sexual instincts to the point of being insensible to the welfare of his patients? His friends would have turned their backs on him.

The other stipulation—the therapy must be successful—is similarly provided for, for there are abundant testimonials from doctors and parents familiar with Dr. Dooley's work.

What if, as the result of Dr. Dooley's experiments, George and Robert and others had turned into unrestrained and aggressive homosexual marauders? Why then, too, Dr. Dooley would have been deserted.

Dr. Dooley then met the two standards his defenders implicitly exacted of him. That is why they supported him.

To deal with the second criterion first: Is rape not wrong if the result of it can be shown to benefit the "patient" —or the society in which she lives? And would the Nazi doctors who experimented with human victims in order to benefit society — and, in a sense, the wretched victims who were thereby put out of their misery—have been heroes rather than brutes, "the most creative" rather than "the most destructive," had they come up with a cure for cancer? Is this what Dr. Dooley's lawyer meant to say when he reminded us that we are living in a raw and bloody world, where life is not for the squeamish?

Dr. Dooley's defenders argue, in effect, that only man's subjective motivations (which modern psychologists themselves tell us may be only a bundle of self-serving rationalizations) determine whether an act is socially objectionable. Whereas a lie is a lie, they would say, it is reprehensible only if the person who commits it means to deceive, or to do harm. A theft is a theft, but not punishable if the thief steals for exalted motives. Espionage is espionage, but not censorable when the spy (as with Klaus Fuchs) claims he acted in the higher interests of mankind. The sexual violation of children is the sexual violation of children, but is not evil if one intends good for the children. By this standard, the only relevant line of inquiry into the demonstrably deranged Jack the Ripper lay in asking whether he intended to do good or evil to his victims—or patients, if that inquiry yields a particular verdict. At a certain point, in such an inquiry, one quite naturally loses sight of just what it is that is "good" or "bad."

Which leads to a final explanation, on which a number of Dr. Dooley's defenders must subconsciously have based their defense, and that is that homosexuality—as therapy—is itself not wrong. That conclusion is hotly urged by the man who compares Parker Dooley to Giordano Bruno. What Dooley did, he is in effect saying, is not substantively different from what Bruno did; hence the tormentors of Dooley are related, through time and space, to the executioners of Bruno.

Bruno rejected a theory of the universe, and was burned at the stake in an age when offenses of that kind were deemed to be outrageous affronts upon society. Experience shows that the treatment of Bruno—and of Galileo and Socrates before him—was unwise and inhuman not because these philosophers have proved to be "correct," for their conclusions continue to be the subject of discussion, but because tolerance toward intellectual dissent is in most circumstances pragmatically useful and humanly desirable. But is the metamorphosis in our attitude toward diverse opinions to guide also our attitude on moral practice? Is it then an anachronism to punish Parker Dooley for his "unorthodox methods"?

That is the tacit assumption of Dr. Dooley's sympathizers, and those who reason as they do, in and out of the Housatonic Valley. To be sure, the force of Dr. Dooley's personality helped to unbalance what would have been the normal judgment of some of his supporters. But among them, there are intellectually nubile men and women, apt students of dedicated relativists and nihilists who spend out their lives in a metaphysical desert, helpless at the hands of seductive practitioners of experimental nostrums who demand no less than human beings for guinea pigs, recognizing no restraint imposed by a natural philosophy or the human personality, promising only that It Works. Homosexuality: Unlearning by Doing, preached James Parker Dooley, and doctors and lawyers and teachers and housewives came running, baring their terrible vulnerability: the length to which the promises of progressivism would carry them.

A Case of Kinship

To the first person submitting a correct answer to this puzzle, in a letter postmarked from anywhere in Illinois, NATIONAL REVIEW *will send a long-playing, twelve-inch recording of Mahler's Symphony No. 1 in D Major. The solution will appear next week.*

There must have been a dearth of eligible young ladies in Newport, for each of five men there has married the widowed mother of one of the others. Johnson's stepson, Jackson, is the stepfather of Harrison. Johnson's mother is a friend of Mrs. Richardson, whose husband's mother is a cousin of Mrs. Harrison.

What is the name of the stepson of Olson?

The THIRD WORLD WAR

JAMES BURNHAM

What Must Be Shall Be

During the past two months Communist spokesmen have been putting an extraordinary emphasis on the classic Marxian doctrine of "inevitability." They have created occasions to affirm a) that socialism has been irrevocably established within the Soviet Union, and b) that the complete world victory of communism is inevitable.

The jolly Khrushchev was the first major contributor to this current review of dialectical philosophy. He took as his classroom the banquet held September 17 in Moscow, at the end of Adenauer's mission. Standing insolently over the pathetic seated figure of the ailing Chancellor, Khrushchev reported: "We told Dr. Adenauer very frankly that West Germany was going the way of capitalist decay. The way of the future is the way of the German Democratic [i.e., Communist] Republic." Khrushchev then declared his total adherence to "the teachings of Marx and Lenin," and summed up his general perspective: "Communism will triumph throughout the world."

Molotov Shriven

Next came the odd incident of Molotov's confession, just before he marched off to Geneva. Molotov's sin was that of having said, at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet last January, that merely "the foundations of socialism," not socialism itself, had been established in the Soviet Union. According to the prevailing interpretation, this confession meant that Molotov was on his way out, if not to liquidation at least obscurity. Nevertheless, he was neither downcast nor demure at Geneva. He spoke for Moscow with all of his old assurance.

Doubtless the confession was in some part a disciplinary measure. But since no real punishment followed, it must be the case that the doctrine itself was genuinely at issue. According to Marxism, socialism is a "higher" historical form than capitalism. By dialectical reasoning it follows that once socialism is actually established, it cannot revert to capitalism, a "lower" form in the flow of history, just as a man cannot revert to being again a boy. Socialism *must* progress to the still higher, and final, stage of communism.

The dogma was then elaborately developed by a long editorial article in the official press. On November 6, Lazar M. Kaganovich, delivering the principal oration for the anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, used a restatement of "inevitability" as his final and climactic sentence: "If the nineteenth century was a century of capitalism, the twentieth century is a century of the triumph of socialism and communism."

Inevitability and Satellites

I believe that this abstract discussion is the theoretical flank of a tactical drive that Moscow is now making on two related fronts.

First, Moscow wants to complete the consolidation of the postwar round of Communist conquests in eastern Europe. To do so requires: a) the legitimization of these conquests through full recognition by the non-Communist world plus UN membership; and b) the abandonment by the peoples of the conquered regions of all hope of liberation.

The doctrine of inevitability is a powerful psychological boost toward this double objective. In general, it paralyzes an opponent's will to resist if you can persuade him that he is sure to lose whatever he does. The Kremlin is saying to the satellite peoples: liberation is a nostalgic dream. That's all water over the dam. It's time to reconcile yourselves to Soviet rule, and to get in step with History.

The same lesson is hammered into the minds of the outside world. Liberation of any territories now under Communist control is historically impossible. Therefore why not just drop the subject? The West (except, perhaps, for Secretary Dulles personally) seems almost ready to agree. We consent to omit the subject of liberation from the agenda of conferences called to consider the causes of world tension. We have proposed a UN "package deal" that would take four more satellites into the UN (Albania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania)—and if we accept these four it looks rather silly to balk at Outer Mongolia. If inevitable, why not now?

Inevitability and Germany

The fact that the first lecture in the present series was delivered to Adenauer serves to locate a second tactical concentration. The Kremlin, in its *philosophical* way, is stating to the Germans: East Germany is already, and irrevocably, within the Soviet orbit. Your nation can be unified only when West Germany moves toward the East. In the long run this is historically inevitable. ("The way of the future is the way of the German Democratic Republic.") To drag the process out only makes it more painful.

This is the basic reality of the Soviet "German policy." It has always been fanciful to imagine that Moscow would ever agree, in uncoerced negotiation, to a German reunification that would leave all Germany free to blot out internal communism and to join the Western bloc.

Unless the Western strategy changes, the Soviet German plan will certainly succeed. Since the West limits itself to defensive conceptions, it offers no solution to Germany, once it becomes clear (as it is now clear) that Moscow will never voluntarily release East Germany. Germany will in the end choose the bitter Kremlin solution rather than no solution at all.

Not only is it impossible to reunify Germany through a defensive strategy. It is impossible even to hold West Germany in line. West Germany can be held only if we seize the initiative. This would mean to institute a campaign of offensive political warfare designed to unify Germany on Western terms by pulling East Germany out of the Soviet clasp. West Germany can be held only by winning East Germany. The East German revolt of June 1953 proved this to be possible, given the Western will to do it.

Presidential "Inability"

II. The Garfield and Wilson Precedents

Last week Prof. Edward S. Corwin[1] discussed in these pages a gap in our Constitution. It is the failure of the Constitution to give the procedures by which a Vice President may succeed a President who falls ill, or in wartime is captured by an enemy, or is otherwise kept from carrying out his duties.

When, last September, Mr. Eisenhower suffered a heart attack in Denver, the country's affairs, for a considerable period, had to be conducted by minute-to-minute improvisation. Mr. Eisenhower's excellent physique, and his swift response to skilled doctoring, brought the crisis to a happy ending. But these are queasy times, and the fortunes of a great country—and of half the world—ought not to be left to improvisation.

Since the 1787 Philadelphia Convention, there have been two major attempts to throw a bridge across the constitutional gap. They were with the assassination of James A. Garfield in 1881, and Woodrow Wilson's long illness in the winter of 1920-21.

Other Presidents had died in office before Garfield, but in each case the period of incapacity had been brief. Garfield was shot at the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad station in Washington on July 2, and did not die until 78 days later, on September 19. The impact on men's minds can be judged from the fact that the whole period of Mr. Eisenhower's hospitalization at Lowry Air Force Base, during much of which Mr. Eisenhower was able to make urgent decisions, was only 50 days.

A group of bills was introduced into the 47th Congress. Even more than the hiatus caused by Garfield's wound, men seem to have been alarmed by there being no constitutional successor to Vice President Chester A. Arthur. The present arrangements for guarding the lives of Presidents and Vice Presidents were unknown, and there was widespread fear that Arthur might also be attacked. Most of the bills dealt with the question who would succeed him.

Two bills went directly to the "inability" gap. That introduced by Representative Frank E. Beltzhoover, Democrat and Carlisle, Pa., lawyer, was of great directness. A citizen — anyone — might petition the Supreme Court, stating why he suspected the President was

47TH CONGRESS,
1ST SESSION.

H. R. 3429

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

January 23, 1882.

Read twice, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BELTZHOOVER introduced the following bill:

A BILL

To ascertain and declare the disability which shall render the President of the United States unable to discharge the powers and duties of his said office, and to provide for devolving said duties on the Vice-President until such disability be removed.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be lawful for any citizen of the United States to present to the Supreme Court of the United States a petition fully setting forth, under oath, his reasons for believing that from sickness or other cause the President of the United States is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and to ask for a rule on said President to show cause why said duties should not be devolved upon the Vice-President until such disability be removed.

SEC. 2. That upon the presenting of said petition it shall be filed, and in the discretion of the court a rule shall be granted on the President of the United States requiring him to show cause why, during the continuance of his alleged disability, the duties of his office should not be devolved upon the Vice-President; and upon an answer being filed to said petition the Supreme Court shall proceed to determine the truth and sufficiency of the matters in said petition contained, and make such decree as shall be just and proper.

SEC. 3. That if in such proceeding the Supreme Court shall decide that the President of the United States is unable, for any cause, to discharge the powers and duties of his office, a decree shall be entered accordingly; and thereupon the Vice-President shall be sworn to act as President, and shall so act until, for sufficient cause shown, the Supreme Court shall determine that the disability on which their said decree was founded has been removed; whereupon the Vice-President shall cease to act as President, and the President shall again resume his office and discharge the powers and duties thereof.

[1] By a regrettable error, Prof. Edward S. Corwin's first name was printed as Edwin in part of last week's edition.

not up to performing his duties. If the Court found the petition to have substance, the President was required to show cause why the Vice President should not take his place. The opportunities for psychotics, pranksters and publicity-hunters are breath-taking.

Initiative to the Cabinet

A second bill came from Senator John J. Ingalls, a Republican of Kansas. He had fought in the Kansas border wars, and had been a Civil War lieutenant-colonel in the Kansas Volunteers. His bill gave the initiative to the members of the President's Cabinet. Whenever two of them agreed on the President's incapacity, they were to write to the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice would summon the Supreme Court, which would forthwith reach a decision, and, if the decision were against the President, would notify the Vice President. Once the President had recovered, the same procedure would be used to put him back in office.

The Garfield period was one of comparative political peace. When Wilson was brought down by cerebral hemorrhage near Kansas City on September 28, 1920, partisan nerves were raw. The year before, Wilson had attempted to purge a number of the Democratic Senate leaders, and called the Republicans unfit to make the peace following World War One. The debate that surrounded Wilson's incapacity had a sharp, and sometimes cruel, edge.

Wilson's case had two parts. In November 1918 he had sailed for the Paris Peace Conference, and, with one trip back, had stayed in Paris for some five months. No other President had made more than a brief trip outside the country. Absence from the country is given as a specific inability in many of the bills introduced in the 66th Congress.

After Wilson, in a train with drawn blinds, was brought back from Kansas City, no outsider got

66TH CONGRESS,
2D SESSION.

H. R. 12609

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 18, 1920.

Mr. ROGERS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

A BILL

To define the provisions of the Constitution of the United States relating to the inability of the President.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Supreme Court of the United States shall, whenever requested by the resolution of either House of Congress, determine whether the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office within the meaning of Article II, section 1, paragraph 5, of the Constitution of the United States, and may utilize such instrumentalities as it sees fit to aid in the determination. In case the Supreme Court finds that the inability exists, the powers and duties of the said office shall devolve upon the Vice President. The Supreme Court may from time to time thereafter upon its own motion and initiative, and shall, whenever requested by the resolution of either House of Congress, determine whether the President's inability has been removed. In case it finds that the inability has been removed, the President shall thereupon resume the exercise of the powers and duties of the said office.

66TH CONGRESS,
2D SESSION.

H. J. RES. 297

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

February 18, 1920.

Mr. FESS introduced the folowing joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment is proposed to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

At the end of paragraph 5, section 1, Article II, add the following:

"Said disability to be determined by the Supreme Court, when authorized by concurrent resolution of Congress. The Vice-President is authorized to call Congress into special session for this purpose upon recommendation of the Cabinet."

into his sickroom until December, when Gilbert M. Hitchcock of Nebraska, the Senate Democratic leader, had a five-minute visit. During the intervening weeks, there had been no authoritative word on the President's condition, and, as was inevitable, rumor had spread luxuriantly. Vice President Thomas R. Marshall firmly squelched a movement which would have had him declare himself President in Wilson's place.

Just How Much "Inability"?

The most fully worked-out of the bills introduced in 1920 was that proposed by Representative John J. Rogers of Massachusetts, the "father" of the State Department's Foreign Service, and husband of the present Representative Edith Nourse Rogers. Rogers, for the first time, edged up to the practical, and immensely difficult, question of just how much lack of ability the President has to have to be unable to continue in office. Rogers' solution was to authorize the Supreme Court to employ such "instrumentalities" as it wished.

Rogers' bill gave the initiative to Congress. Either House, by resolution, might put in action the Supreme Court, which would make the decision. Upon finding the President incapable, the Court would keep jurisdiction, and would decide when his office might be restored to him. Rogers reintroduced his bill in 1921.

The only proposal to amend the Constitution came from Representative Simeon D. Fess, a Republican of Ohio and later Senator. The amendment, which was to follow Article II, Section 5, was succinct in words and complicated in procedure. The Cabinet would recommend to the Vice President a special session of Congress, and by concurrent resolution of Congress, the Supreme Court would act.

A third bill, by Representative Martin B. Madden, a Republican of Illinois, gave responsibility to the Secretary of State. The Secretary at the time, it may be noted, was Robert Lansing, uncle of the present Secretary Dulles, and one of the most active in trying to pull together a *de facto* government during the most uncertain period of Wilson's illness. The Secretary of State was to initiate an inquiry by the full Cabinet, which would make the decision. Madden went into the practical criteria of inability, stipulating that it must exist for six weeks.

Apparently this provision was intended primarily to set a limit on the President's wanderings abroad. Other bills had to do wholly with the President's absence from the country.

The Resistance

(The information in this column, transmitted by a special correspondent, comes from first-hand sources.)

The Stubborn Peasants

Throughout eastern Europe active peasant resistance to collectivization is maintained. In Poland only 500 new collectives have been organized this year (through October) as against 3,000 in 1953. Trials of peasants in numerous towns prove the existence of an underground operating against collectivization. In Lublin 37 peasants, led by Stanislaw Suczynski, have just been tried under charges of armed raids on police and party headquarters as well as collectives. This is the first case in which the political character of the peasant underground has been openly admitted. (Heretofore the accusations have been of hooliganism and banditry.) In Bialystok and Wlodawa other peasant groups (led, respectively, by Boleslaw Bubienczyk and Jan Stefaniuk) have been tried secretly for "sabotage" and anti-collectivization "terrorism," which had paralyzed official plans. The Communist authorities in many districts are unable to provide adequate protection for local party officials.

The Wlodawa trial, which opened in Zlobek on October 28, concerned the case of the sabotage of the Adam Mickiewicz Collective Farm. The Communist authorities produced 120 witnesses who gave evidence against Stefaniuk, Jan Blazewicz and Kazimierz Kudlarek, named as the leaders of an armed peasant group. They were specifically accused of sabotaging the party organization and of setting fire to the house of the chairman of the collective, one Antoni Oziemblo. In many districts, as a result of such acts, collectivization plans have been postponed for an indefinite period.

Failure of Repatriation

The world-wide campaign, started early this year to persuade exiles from the satellite nations to return home, is a failure. From the 150,000 Poles in England only 27 (all over 50) have gone back.

This repatriation campaign has been directed from Moscow and carried out by all the satellite governments. Throughout the world it has been widely publicized. Every sort of pressure and inducement is being used to get prominent exiles to agree to come back. It is planned as a long-range operation, with special organizations set up to "liquidate" the emigration problem. It is rumored in eastern Europe that Moscow may ask the Western governments for assistance in this campaign, in exchange for the (formal) dissolution of the Cominform.

Former German prisoners of the Soviets, some of whom have been sent back as a result of the agreement with Adenauer, confirm the revolt in the Vorkuta forced labor camps, and bring additional news of a series of revolts that took place in the complex of camps located in Kazakhstan. They also state that many East Europeans released from Soviet camps are being held at transit points inside the Soviet Union. (For example 7,000 Poles are at Patma, 400 kilometers east of Moscow.) The satellite governments are afraid that their return might strengthen anti-Soviet feelings, and that many of the ex-prisoners would find their way into the opposition.

Foreign Trends . . . w.s.

Europe, in a new tremor of sudden recognition, begins to realize that she might be alone. What the European neutralist has noisily dreamed about since 1946, seems to be coming true—the "Ami" seems to have gone home. This, at the moment, is the trembling apprehension in the rarified circles where (in this old world still without an effective public opinion) foreign policy is being determined—in the Chancellories, the Foreign Offices and all the other monopolistic clubs of political professionalism.

The shock is primarily paralytic. Which is to say that official Europe, with her eyes glued to the new and unbelievable posture of American friendliness vis-à-vis the fast expanding Soviet world, will move only when pushed. There is, in this state of shock, a premium on rigidity. Nothing matters to any European government but to be alive tomorrow (even with the help of Red votes in parliament, as happened in Italy and France). For tomorrow might be the day when it all will be resolved: Was the fatuous grin at Geneva indeed the last Europe will see of America?

Eggheads, Anonymous

The international cavorting in which America's certified eggheads delight (they seem to be craving secret covenants, secretly arrived at) cannot always be handled discreetly. Sure enough, the respectable American press will not so much as whisper about anything Mr. Paul G. Hoffman wishes to withhold from the American public. But the foreign press is occasionally less obliging. The German press, for instance, was recently irritated beyond genteel self-control by the clumsy haughtiness of the organizers of a hush-hush conference in Garmish-Partenkirchen.

The town's fancy "Alpenhof" had rudely cancelled all previous rental agreements with private guests and had suddenly rented all 140 beds to His Royal Highness, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. If this was to shut up the inquisitiveness of the legitimate Bavarian Government, the exaggerated level of the implied exterritoriality only prodded the German newspaper crowd into frantic activity. And soon the following Americans were identified among the 140 anonymous guests of Prince Bernhard:

General Alfred Gruenther (Chief of NATO);

Under-Secretary of State, Robert Murphy;

George Kennan ("of Princeton University");

Paul G. Hoffman.

In other words, top tofficials of the incumbent Administration went abroad in the company of the foreign-policy official of the democratic government-in-exile. Even more, the generous Prince had invited, right next to the most responsible officers of NATO (Lord Ismay, its Secretary General, in addition to General Gruenther and others), such mossy eggheads of the European left as the Secretary General of the French Socialist Party, Guy Mollet, the perennially "controversial" (and entirely irresponsible) Jean Monnet, the coy Hamlet among the Italian Christian Democrats, Amintore Fanfani, and the German Social-Democratic Falstaff, Carlo Schmidt.

But even the aroused curiosity of the German press could not establish the names of a super-secret group of royal guests—nuclear scientists from America and several West European countries. However, it was disclosed that this autumn conclave in Garmish-Partenkirchen was by no means the first meeting of the egghead *Internationale*: in May 1954, Prince Bernhard had presided over an initial session at Schloss Bilderberg, in Holland, and a few months later the group met secretly at Barbizon, in France.

The nearest thing the German press could produce to a definition of the incredible group was this enigmatic statement in the *Spiegel* (Hamburg): "A kind of conspiracy of potent figures—alerted against the dangers of the narrow-mindedness of official policies when based on one-sided information." And the same *Spiegel* thus defined the main topics of the Garmisch "conspiracy": "economic exploitation of atomic energy, without yielding these new resources to private interests; the deadly aspects of an atomic war in Europe and the political means of its prevention." In short, the exact program of European socialists and neutralists. But what actually happened when Paul G. Hoffman rubbed eggheads with Guy Mollet remained undisclosed. "The participants," reported the German press with a sigh of frustration, "were acutely conscious that not even the shortest note was left behind on the conference tables when a session came to a close." And the royal egghead, one keeps hearing, talks very little even to the Queen of Holland.

But could not a Senator ask a few pertinent questions—say, next time the State Department comes hustling for appropriations?

Vienna (without music)

Just a few days before Vienna bewitched the world with her potent musical charm, Soviet Commissar Kobanov signed in the self-same Vienna a document that completely undid any possible political promise broadcast from the new Staatsoper. Since Kobanov's busy visit of late October, Austria has a valid Trade Treaty with Soviet Russia—and it is a beaut. The treaty makes no bones about the prime concern of Soviet trade with Austria, namely, the progressive annihilation of Austria's economic exchange with the West: of the stipulated annual Russian exports to Austria, about 80 per cent represent Soviet substitutes for commodities Austria would normally purchase in the West. And how can the hard-pressed Soviet economy so magnanimously earmark such primarily industrial commodities for Austria? Quite simply. The Soviet traders expect full access to the American market and, in the cockeyed Spirit of Geneva, they expect to pay with a smile. In that case, they can safely promise to future dependencies like Austria what they can get in America. The result: Soviet trade successes in America are immediately used as a leverage to separate Austria from the West. Theoretically, the scheme is vulnerable: it can work only so long as the American policy makers don't know the score (or don't care). Which, of course, means that the scheme is practically safe—so long as a Harold Stassen does the bargaining for the U.S.

Meaning of Geneva

The London *Observer* suggests that Molotov's purpose at Geneva meeting No. 2 was to clarify the Russian interpretation of "the Geneva spirit," advertised product of last summer's meeting No. 1. To Moscow the Geneva spirit meant not an era of good feeling between East and West, but, first, "the ratification of a state of strategic stalemate between the United States and Soviet Russia," and, second, notification to the satellite countries that "any relaxation in tension between Russia and the United States . . . does not imply any relaxation of Soviet control over their policies and destinies."

The New French Majority

During November a fundamental change took place in the composition of the working majority that, with insignificant changes, has been supporting not only the present French Government of Monsieur Faure but the various shifting Premiers for several years back. This majority has been an alliance of the Center parties with considerable portions of the Right.

In the votes of confidence that the Premier forced on the issue of rules for the forthcoming elections, much of the Right (except for some Gaullists) left him, and he won a majority only with the help of the Communists. The vote of November 12, for example, was 285-247; but 90 of the 285 pro-government votes were Communist.

The French parliamentary game is exceedingly delicate, but the entire French press well knows the importance of this development. The French Government now holds office only by sufferance of the Communists. The papers of the non-Communist parties (there are literally dozens of French parties) denounce the Premier *pro forma*, but the tone in many cases sounds envious rather than indignant. All understand that the Communist decision to uphold Faure on the election rules is based on maneuvers to increase the Communist chances in the election, and in the longer term to move toward the new Popular Front that is now the central objective of Communist Party policy in France.

Pierre Le Brun, head of the Communist-controlled General Labor Federation (CGT), is the latest to call for a broad new Popular Front that will include Communists, Socialists and the Republican parties of the traditional French Left, a number of which have recently combined in an association labeling itself "the New Left" (*la Nouvelle Gauche*).

So far, Pierre Mendès-France is outside this tendency. His followers in the Assembly voted against the Premier and thereby against the Communists on the election issues.

L'Express, speaking for Mendès-France, continues its concern with the events in Africa. It insists that the return of Ben Youssef as Sultan of Morocco is far from enough to settle the revolutionary issues there. In Algeria, it reports, eleven revolutionists who were in prison under sentence of death escaped on November 11. Among them was the notorious Ben Boulaid Mostefa, leader of the most violent wing of the Algerian nationalists, and reputed organizer of the major revolt that took place November 1, 1954.

Strict Logicians, These Commissars

Although the German prisoners in the Soviet Union are being released in a trickle instead of the stream that Bulganin promised Adenauer, a number have returned to the West. Their stories are gradually appearing in the European press. Rome's *Il Tempo* publishes an informative interview with a German architect, just arrived from the Urals. After mentioning that one section of one of his slave camp residences had held six hundred Italian soldiers (privates, no officers), he notes his surprise at having come across a good many German Jews. On inquiry he discovered that they had been among the small company of Jews still alive in East Germany at the end of the war. They had naturally welcomed the Red Army with open arms ("with open heart," in the Italian phrase). But the MGB arrested, tried and sentenced them "under suspicion of having been in the Nazi service." The MGB reasoning was hard to beat: If they hadn't been working for the Nazis, they would have been dead. Ergo, the classic principle of anti-Semitism: the only innocent Jew is a dead Jew.

Meteorological Report

Whatever the conferences do to the rest of the world, they at least bring good business to the Geneva hotels. But even Geneva got bored at this last performance. A reporter for *La Tribune de Genève*, toward the end, headed his lead article: "Pointless and Interminable Repetitions on the German Problem." His first subhead was: "Where They Listen but Don't Hear." "What was the atmosphere of the session?" the British spokesman was asked. "The atmosphere doesn't change much from day to day," was the truly British reply. The reporter adds: "This was the only question and the only reply at the press conference."

Every Man a Lord

The English press believes that Clement Attlee will resign soon as head of the British Labor Party. When he does, he is expected to be made a peer, and thereby enabled to shift parliamentary activities from the House of Commons to the House of Lords. Not only the couple of dozen Labor peers already on hand but, apparently, the Conservative earls, dukes and viscounts—whose titles date somewhat further back—are eager to welcome Lord Clement of Fabiana (the title, according to custom, will be his to choose). Some of the ancient Lords feel that an infusion of fresh socialist blood-and-water tends in our egalitarian age to make an aristocracy more palatable to the people. But a difficulty is recognized. Few Labor Lords can count on much in the way of "private incomes or plush directorships." The thoughtful proposal has been made that the Treasury provide a side-income of £1,000 a year to a few leading Lords so that they can take care of "the occasional meal, the odd drink, petrol for the car"—in short, those occupational expenses that "can be a real hardship and keep a man away from the Upper House."

JUNKET: *Travel at public expense by legislators who ought to be at home appropriating funds for Executive employees to travel at public expense.*

ON THE LEFT... C.B.R.

In the Geneva Spirit. American Communists have been quick to exploit the mythical "Spirit of Geneva" to their own advantage. Before the U.S. Court of Appeals in the case of Claude Lightfoot, convicted Communist leader, John J. Abt, counsel, cited in sworn testimony as a former member of an underground cell of the Communist Party operating in Washington, D. C., argued that the easing of international tensions had weakened the government's charge that the defendant represented a "clear and present danger" to the United States. He posed the question whether "calmer times" had now arrived.

Red Tribulations. Since 1950 the Communist Party has suffered a loss of 10 per cent in membership each year, according to a report to a recent New York State Committee conference of the party. Particularly heavy were the losses among Negro and Puerto Rican members.

For Service Rendered. David Alfaro Siqueiros, Mexican muralist, who was involved in one of the attempts to assassinate Leon Trotsky, has been commissioned to decorate Communist Warsaw's newly built Tenth Anniversary Stadium, according to the Polish Ministry of Culture and Art.

Dust Thou Art, and unto Dust Shalt Thou Return. Unnoticed by all except the *Daily Worker,* the New York Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was quietly buried at a membership meeting held at 35 West 64th Street early in November. In its deathbed message it announced that it had voted "to close a proud chapter in the cultural and political life of the nation." The Council was part of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (ICCASP), which was unpopularly known as HICCUPS.

We present as a suitable epitaph the testimony of Louis F. Budenz, who was formerly managing editor of the *Daily Worker*:

> The Independent [Citizens] Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions was worked out originally in my office in the *Daily Worker.* It was worked out by the cultural commission of the *Daily Worker,* of which Lionel Berman, the cultural section organizer of the [Communist] party was a member, and he was entrusted not only by that meeting but by the political committee [of the party], as a result of these discussions with the task of forming the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions.

Little Red Schoolhouse. Among those listed as patrons of a benefit performance of "No Time for Sergeants" for the Little Red Schoolhouse in New York City are Governor W. Averell Harriman and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. It will be recalled that when Randolph Belmont Smith, director of this well-known model school, appeared before a congressional committee, he invoked the Fifth Amendment in refusing to answer questions as to his Communist Party membership. His wife, Grace Gilbert Smith, one-time supervisor of the state nursery school program and later district director of the all-day neighborhood schools program under the auspices of the Public Education Association, invoked the same privilege.

Never Say Die. Neither the House Judiciary Committee nor that of the Senate has taken cognizance of the nation-wide challenge of the Communists and their followers to existing security legislation. A "Friends of the Court" brief filed with the U. S. Supreme Court attacks the validity of state sedition laws in Florida, Kentucky, New Hampshire and Massachusetts. *The Atom Spy Hoax* by William A. Reuben, which is widely publicized by the Communist press, even goes so far as to open up cases long since closed.

The audacity of this challenge is disclosed by the following items from its table of contents: "Canada: The Atom Spy Plot That Never Was"; "Klaus Fuchs: The Evidence Was in the Headlines"; "Harry Gold: 'I Lied Desperately' "; "Julius Rosenberg: A Jello Box-Top Was the Clue." It is reported that Virginius Frank Coe and William L. Ullman will imitate Alger Hiss in writing articles disputing the charges made against them by Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers, as part of a systematic attempt to weaken American faith in our judicial system and in Congress.

Lesson. Harry Sacher will be remembered as the attorney who continually harassed Judge Harold R. Medina during the trial of the eleven Communist leaders in 1949. Judge Medina imposed a sentence of six months upon Sacher for contempt of court, and the latter subsequently was disbarred. The Court of Appeals held that

> The record discloses a judge, sorely tried for many months of turmoil, constantly provoked by useless bickering, exposed to offensive slights and insults, harried by interminable repetition, who, if at times he did not conduct himself with the imperturbability of a Rhadamanthus, showed considerably greater self-control and forbearance than it is given to most judges to possess.

What is not generally known is the flagellation of this eminent jurist by members of the U.S. Supreme Court when Sacher's conviction for contempt was reversed.

> *Justice Hugo Black*: Yet from the very parts of the record which Judge Medina specified, it is difficult to escape the impression that his inferences against the lawyers were colored, however unconsciously, by his natural abhorrence for the unpatriotic and treasonable designs attributed to their Communist leader clients. . . . Are defendants accused by judges of being offensive to them to be conclusively presumed guilty on the theory that judges' observations and inferences must be accepted as infallible?
>
> *Justice Felix Frankfurter*: Truth compels the observation, painful as it is to make it, that the fifteen volumes of oral testimony in the principal trial record numerous episodes involving the judge and defense counsel that are more suggestive of an undisciplined debating society than of the hush and solemnity of a court of justice. . .
>
> *Justice William O. Douglas*: I agree with Mr. Justice Frankfurter that one who reads the record will have difficulty in determining whether members of the bar conspired to drive a judge from the bench or whether the judge used the authority of the bench to whipsaw the lawyers, to taunt and tempt them, and to create for himself the role of the persecuted. . .

The lesson which Communist lawyers will draw from the Supreme Court's decision regarding the conduct of Harry Sacher is: go and do likewise.

LABOR...

JONATHAN MITCHELL

After some twenty cat-calling years, the eight million members of the AFL and five million of the CIO are about to end their un-neighborliness, and at the AFL and CIO conventions in New York, a hole will be punched in the dividing wall of the House of Labor. The new cordiality has limits—for example, the name of the unified body. The AFL delegates think American Federation of Labor a suitable name; the CIO men wish none of it. But, in general, the more the delegates are together, the merrier they seem to be.

Other Americans will not find it as merry. Big Government, Big Business and Big Labor are the stuff of nightmares—the standard kind of coast-to-coast Fruehauf trailers bearing down on a frightened pup at a road intersection, and crows cawing as they fly to their pitiful feast.

Some time back, the Pennsylvania Mennonites, a group that has managed to keep a firm grasp on the values of life, took an attentive look around the United States and began emigrating to Paraguay. It is hard to say this was not an appropriate gesture.

But those of us who remain here are entitled to draw a limited amount of comfort. The harm done to the flexibility of American society by the coming together of the AFL and CIO is probably more in the trend it shows than the immediate power it will give the labor movement. The movement is still feudalistic, with authority held by the heads of the dozen biggest unions, rather than a centralized monarchy. The dues-paying members of the lords who head these unions will still lie under a heavy hand, but the rest of us Americans can, for the present, draw advantage from their mutual jealousies. Mice do well not merely when one cat is away, but when a dozen cats are eyeing each other with vengeful rivalry.

One gain that the labor movement, as a whole, is supposed to receive from the new AFL-CIO unity is the organizing of the unorganized. This is to be in Mr. Walter Reuther's charge, and a nominee of his will be director of a new AFL-CIO department. The chief pool of still-unorganized factory workers is in the Southeastern states, and Mr. Reuther's adventures there will be immensely interesting.

The writer is reliably struck with wonder at each new story of the Southeast. A day or so ago, he was told how, in many textile mills, a girl cares for 50,000 spindles, and the problem is to find enough for her to do. The machines need to be looked at once an hour; a tour, unless something has gone wrong, takes fifteen or twenty minutes. To meet the tendency of girls to wander off on their own concerns, many mills have built air-cooled rooms, with soft-drink dispensers, radio and magazines. The girls are lured back to the room, from which they can be promptly sent out at the beginning of the next hour.

Even the high-toned spinners, in some mills, exercise charge over twenty "sides," or 2,800 spindles. And textile mills, of course, are at the bottom of the automation scale, and compare badly with the silent, inhuman stretches of chemical plants.

The question is what these factories are doing to the notion of work. Try changing the ancient couplet:

> When Adam ran a rototiller,
> And Eve an electric sewing machine
> with fifty-four different attachments,

and see whether Adam's curse, and gentlemanliness, have their accustomed emotional tone. There are signs other than high-scoring basketball teams that the Southeast is becoming education-happy.

It may be that the youngsters of the Southeastern states will be the first American group to look on Male and Female Help Wanted—repetitive jobs—as unrelated to themselves. Their proper work will be not with materials, but machines, as machine builders and repairers.

This is the problem that Mr. Reuther's organizers in a unified AFL-CIO must deal with. What meaning will production quotas, work assignments and seniority regulations have for the great-grandchildren of the Confederacy? This is not to say all Southeastern factories, or even a majority of them, are of the post-World War Two period. Birmingham, Alabama, has long been a union town, and Atlanta, Georgia, is becoming one. But the new factories are creating a changed concept of work, and it may be that unions, as they now exist, will never succeed in getting the loyalties of those employed in them.

The remaining unorganized will be the subject of New York convention speeches. But in hotel suites, more weight is likely to be put on politics. Unity is supposed to give the AFL-CIO a political hammer of Thor. Here again, Mr. Reuther will be boss, with a nominee of his as head of a combined political committee.

In his three chief previous tries at electioneering, Mr. Reuther's showing was indifferent. He tried to bring down the late Senator Taft of Ohio in 1950, and failed. The results strongly suggested that the heads of other unions gave Mr. Taft secret help, and did so partly to check Mr. Reuther's power.

Last year, he had a large hand in knocking out Senator Homer Ferguson of Michigan. Michigan, however, is a delicately balanced state, where majorities are determined by jewelers' scales, and it was thirty-six hours before the victory of Mr. Reuther's candidate, the present Senator Pat McNamara, was known. Just eight weeks ago, Mr. Reuther lost an Ohio measure to legalize his Guaranteed Annual Wage plan.

Offsetting this record with the voters is Mr. Reuther's secure place in the Democratic Party's left wing. If Mr. Stevenson, or another candidate close to the ADA, could be elected next year, Mr. Reuther would be inside the White House, and a major political power.

But this patch of wool may be orlon. Mr. Reuther has to first catch his subservient Democratic President. Most candidates—and this probably includes Mr. Stevenson—are not sure whether the new AFL-CIO political committee will be a help or hindrance. Again, Mr. Reuther will have to deal with Mr. George Meany, the AFL-CIO president, Mr. Dave Beck of the Teamsters, Mr. George MacDonald of the United Steelworkers. Some day, if the drift toward bigness continues, a labor leader will arise who will succeed in crushing his brother labor barons. It is doubtful if Mr. Reuther carries a heavy enough lance.

The Liberal Line...

WILLMOORE KENDALL

The Liberal propaganda machine, as this column pointed out last week and the week before, is in sore trouble. And its behavior through the past week, during which its operatives have been publicly disagreeing with one another about the implications of the recent Foreign Ministers' Conference, becomes intelligible only when we recognize *why* it is in trouble and why, unless by some miracle it divests itself of the Liberal mentality, it is going to remain in trouble.

The machine is in trouble because:

1. Its basic analysis of communism and the Soviet Union is incorrect, so that each new development in U.S.-USSR relations takes it by surprise.

2. It is deeply committed to the "principle" that military showdowns, though all right when you are dealing with Nazis or Fascists, are ipso facto immoral when you are dealing with Communists.

3. The machine is deeply convinced of the miracle-working properties, where U.S.-USSR relations are concerned, of high-level negotiations — the more convinced, indeed, because at the margin it draws no distinction between the U.S. negotiating and the U.S. giving away its shirt; so that whenever U.S.-USSR negotiations fail, the only recommendation it can come up with is that we toss another asset into the appeasement hopper.

4. The machine never learns anything. Given its basic attitude toward events and toward the discussion processes, it *cannot* learn anything; so that each new event, whatever the lesson it bears upon its face, merely confirms the machine in what it believed yesterday and the day before; and it thinks of the discussion process merely as a means by which *it* conveys *its* wisdom to *others*.

5. The USSR, as the conference clearly showed, is at present in no mood to be appeased by anything the U.S. could afford to give away.

If you think this doesn't add up to serious trouble, imagine yourself as chairman of the committee that hands down the machine's major directives, and ask yourself what line you would direct it to adopt. The Liberals cannot be caught saying, "Now we know, finally, that negotiations with the Russians never accomplish anything, so let's forget about negotiations." To propose such a thing would require abandoning their commitment to the miracle-working properties of negotiations. Nor can they say, "Let's postpone further negotiations until we have regained the position of effective military superiority vis-à-vis the Russians that we enjoyed back in 1945," as that would involve dealing with Communists as though they were Fascists. Nor even, "Let's challenge the whole set of axioms we have been proceeding on about communism and the USSR, and take under advisement some alternative axioms, on the off-chance that they might enable us to win the next round"; for in order to propose any such thing, the Liberals would have to be prepared to learn from events, and even to listen to persons whom they have publicly dismissed over the years as irrelevant and stupid. So what is left for them to do?

The machine appears to have met the problem thus far by letting its operatives choose one or more of several apparently conflicting directives:

1. *Admit the failure of the conference; admit also that the spirit of Geneva seems, for the moment, to be a U.S. monopoly; but plug it as a good bet anyhow.* Thus we find the *Herald Tribune* admitting that our outstanding problems "do not show themselves amenable to being settled for the time being by talk . . ." but contenting itself with the inference: "all together we must keep trying." Why? Because "an opportunity may open where now there seems nothing but a blank wall," and because "failure at getting immediate results does not mean that there will never be success." And we find *Life* on the ragged edge of saying that the spirit of Geneva is a good thing even if it never gets us anywhere. "The spirit of Geneva is something we must do everything in our power to keep alive, whether the Soviets let it accomplish anything or not." Why? Because it "is and always has been the American spirit."

2. *Fix attention on the Big Issue, and insist that the Foreign Ministers' Conference, properly regarded, was a success because it consolidated the gains of the meeting at the summit.* As Mr. Lippmann puts it: "The real spirit of Geneva is . . . with us . . . as much today as before Mr. Molotov made his statements . . . [At] the summit meeting in July a public accord was reached that neither side would . . . resort to thermonuclear war. The real spirit of Geneva is the result of the fact that it is impossible to threaten war and therefore unnecessary to fear war in which the great powers participate."

3. *Argue that we should forthwith resume negotiations and give away our shirt in order to keep them going; pass lightly over the fact that we can't—or at least have always thought we couldn't—do without our shirt.* Mr. Lippmann, who alone has been courageous enough to have a go at this one, implements this position with an argument that we may paraphrase as follows: During the recent conference, we treated German membership in NATO as an unnegotiable asset. We insisted that Germany be unified and yet retain membership in our military alliance. Such terms have proved unacceptable to the Russians. Now: if we maintain a position that is not negotiable, the Russians will lose confidence in our good sense and even in our sincerity; while if we treat German membership in NATO as negotiable, as something we are prepared to give up, Moscow will be unable to reject unification without great loss of face. Which then shall we do? Bring about "deep dislocation" of the NATO military structure by reading Germany out of it? Or stand pat and see Germany unified on Russia's terms?

At the last moment, to be sure, Mr. Lippmann rejects the conclusion to which the argument inescapably leads. Few of his readers, however, will have missed the point: we lose Germany either way. And not many—fortunately for the Liberal line—will pose for themselves the question which Mr. Lippmann is careful not to raise: Might we have saved Germany had we made it our business to take a position from the beginning to which we were prepared to adhere?

From the Academy

RUSSELL KIRK

Riverside Restoration

Is higher education in America fit for human beings? That question, I think, will have to be asked with increasing seriousness throughout the next ten years; for we are confronted with the prospect of a gigantic and indiscriminate expansion of university and college enrollments and "plant." And one of the principal dangers in this development is that our educational institutions will become nothing but "plant." What Juenger calls "the triumph of technology" may so engulf our universities and colleges that they will depart altogether from the human scale. The present pressing need is for what Professor Bestor calls "the restoration of learning." A part of that restoration must be the return of the processes of higher education to a human scale, as well as to the humane disciplines.

In most of the present agitation about academic freedom—and much of this discussion is cant—the postulates upon which the real theory of academic freedom rests are quite neglected. Those postulates are two: first, that the Academy must include a body of learned and earnest professors, intent upon conserving and extending the Truth; second, that the Academy must include a body of genuine students, well grounded in the fundamentals of the academic disciplines, who really desire to learn something. If the professors are quarter-educated doctrinaires, sedulous to engage in secular indoctrination rather than in a real search for Truth, then they have no right to academic freedom, and are sure to lose it. And if the students are so ill-prepared for the higher education that they cannot really form independent judgments, but must take for Holy Writ whatever their professors say, then the reason for academic freedom has vanished, the Academy having degenerated into a custodial institution where the immature are exposed to "socialization" and indoctrinated in "approved social attitudes."

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, with whom I have had some profound disagreements over questions of academic freedom, recently said something very pertinent to this thesis:

> It is true that the academic body has been in serious danger of losing its independence. The reason is that nobody can understand why it should have it. And the reason why nobody can understand this is that the colleges and universities of this country have, in their desire for popularity and money, glady responded to every pressure and every demand. They have insisted on their dependence; they have become folk institutions reflecting the whims, no matter how frivolous or temporary, of those whose support they hope to gain.

Now "academic freedom," as a formalized and legalized concept, first got its name in the early years of the German Empire, when it was found necessary to guarantee the professor some degree of limited freedom of expression and research in a state-dominated university system. More and more, here in America, with the triumph of the state educational institution over the private college, we are confronted with the same problem. It is heartening, therefore, to find that some few attempts are being made to face this difficulty and to lift our state universities and colleges above the level of a dreary intellectual mediocrity and the status of "folk institutions." Neither real intellectual attainment nor academic freedom will survive much longer among us unless our huge state institutions begin to make provision for the professor who is a real scholar and the student who really wants to learn.

Perhaps the most interesting and encouraging of these new experiments at state institutions is the University of California at Riverside. Until two years ago, this was simply the citrus-fruit experiment station of the University of California. But now a very different institution is opened there: a College of Letters and Science, under the direction of a distinguished historical sociologist, Dean R. A. Nisbet. Quality, not quantity, is the aim of this college. I think it will succeed.

At present, the College of Letters and Science, University of California at Riverside, has a faculty of eighty-nine members and a student body of 714. The administration of the college is glad that enrollment is not growing rapidly, and hopes that some maximum-enrollment may be fixed eventually by the Regents. The faculty is a distinguished group: it includes, for instance, Dr. J. W. Olmsted, a Rhodes scholar, who is chairman of the Division of Humanities; and Professor Philip E. Wheelwright, the well-known critic. Some of the departments are remarkably original in their approach: the department of education, for example, promises to fulfill some of Dr. Arthur Bestor's suggestions for the reform of the teaching of pedagogy, and contents itself with offering about a dozen courses, in contrast with the proliferation of vacuous courses in "methods" by most educationists.

Most heartening of all, perhaps, is the projected program of honors courses, as distinguished from the program for ordinary students. This system, now taking form, is founded upon the example of the British universities; and it is intended to recognize and encourage the talents of the superior student, without separating him arbitrarily from the rest of the undergraduate body. In both ordinary and honors programs, department specialization to the exclusion of a liberal breadth of view is avoided; but the scheme of "general education" appears to stand head and shoulders above most such plans for general studies at state universities.

The great problem of the age, Newman said more than a century ago, is the education of the masses. That still is the great problem of the age. Possibly the best way to work toward a solution, in our present confusion, is to devise means for leavening the masses; certainly the application of Deweyite doctrines of mass-education has only lowered the whole tone of American higher education. Deweyism no longer is "progressive" in any real sense. But the Riverside experiment, intended to conserve the elevation and freedom of the intellectual disciplines, has the chance of making genuine progress.

ARTS and MANNERS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

When the doctor told me I must not get excited, at least not for the next six months, I knew right away that this Broadway season will be good for me. For no matter how many contracts will be broken—between the producers and the public, between the directors and the rules of good taste, between the arts in general and their procurers—Broadway most certainly will keep a promise not to excite a critic of whom the doctor has gleefully got hold.

Not that the critic likes excitement. He is (it pleases him to think) a truly conservative creature—and he'd better introduce himself. For during the next few years (or so he hopes, if only for the sake of his doctor's reputation), he will perform on this page the most subjective piece of surgery known to subjective man: he will pronounce judgment on artifacts. Now the reader expects that much; for the reader is intelligent, which he proves by subscribing to this magazine, and therefore free of such sophomoric illusions as that of "objective" criticism. But even the intelligent reader needs to be protected against fraud, and there is no more reprehensible fraud than that of a criticism whose bias has not been openly stated. So let me introduce myself, the critic—in the third person, if I may, to control my embarrassment (as I have rather nice things to say about him).

His two outstanding characteristics are reverence and humor. His reverence is for the accumulated wisdom of the race, for the painstaking integrity of craftsmanship, for the unfathomable and unpredictable mysteries of creation. His humor is born of a warm-blooded pity for man's incorrigible imperfections. Both reverence and humor prevent him from taking the universe not seriously enough, or himself too seriously. Both show in his courteous skepticism toward the new: he tends to estimate its worth by judging how well it will age. He is in perfect and serene agreement with life because he has no illusions about it; his digestion is good and his manners even better. Originality impresses him far less than perfection, and beauty far more than zeal. He appreciates the young esthetically, distrusts them philosophically and encourages them mainly to grow up fast. He offends only when he means to (which, you will recall, makes him a gentleman), and his curiosity, though active, is moderated by his informed suspicion that this is a very old world and that everything has been thought and said before. He knows that character is more important than success. He sympathizes with the common man for being common and will sternly advise him to get himself out of the rut. He considers taste not an accidental but an essential of inner quality, form the proof of content, gracefulness the reward of truth. He loves laughter, detests cynicism, is flexible in his appetites and immovably stubborn in his moral convictions.

So my doctor can be reassured that I really do not want excitement. My idea of a perfect evening has always been to listen to an old performance of *Don Giovanni*, my eyes closed so that they can see the perfection of a dear girl next to me. (Should the doctor protest that this arrangement clearly constitutes excitement, I am prepared to floor him with the classical argument that the truly expected cannot truly excite; or, if even it can, is most certainly welcome to do so.) And yet, I appreciate the secure boredom of Broadway not without several sincere regrets.

In the first place, it is a rather beastly fate for a critic to have as his main target Arthur Miller. What fun, what achievement, what conceit is there in proving that Arthur Miller is Arthur Miller? But what is one to do? The incredible fact is that Mr. Miller, give or take a little Tennessee Williams, has remained for ten years the only talent Broadway has discovered. I need say no more, Doctor. There will be no excitement.

When Clifford Odets was the current Shakespeare, I was not engaged in Broadway criticism; and for all one knows, a critic's nights might then have been just as uneventful as they are nowadays. And yet, I suspect that the feeble-mindedness that is Broadway was less insufferable in the thirties. For one, there seems to have been then a rumor at large that the woods were full of Clifford Odetses—a terrifying thought for anyone who can hardly stand one, but a great encouragement for the innocently dumb, or virginal, Liberal mind which honestly believes that three halfwits more than make up for the absence of a whole one. And then there was the exhilaration of a purge—a chemically induced purge, to be sure, but a purge nonetheless: the theater was being cleansed of the old drawing-room fare, and brand-new (or so they thought) and vital stuff was being rammed down its throat.

It's still being rammed down Broadway's throat, by Arthur Miller mainly, but there is no one who would deny that even a familiar crack from a French drawing-room farce is more vital stuff and, if there is such a thing, more brand-new. For there is nothing staler than a stale revolution, and nothing less exhilarating than a child prodigy grown middle-aged. The worst that must be said about Mr. Miller is the best that can be said about him—that he makes one think of Clifford Odets in the thirties, poor Mr. Miller.

As it happens, an excruciatingly clumsy finger exercise of his is being shown on Broadway (*A View from the Bridge*), but this was not the reason I picked on Mr. Miller. Rather, I honestly meant to greet him, with a peculiar sadness, as just about the only playwright whom this critic will have to take seriously—well, not exactly seriously, alas, but as nearly seriously as any one who spent a lifetime on *Don Giovanni* can take the author of *Death of a Salesman*.

And now bring on the dancing girls, the supernumeraries, the phony sweetness, the sweet phoniness of Broadway! I shall report them faithfully, without cheating anybody, including myself. But as to excitement, there just will be none—except, that is, the enormous excitement provided by Mr. Brooks Atkinson of the *New York Times*. Here, I can promise you, you will encounter a tale of murder and violence—of murdered truth and violated nature. I promise you that the country's certified czar of the arts will always excite me to mayhem, doctor or no doctor. For he is still the hottest thing on Broadway. He'll find me game.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Sex in the Desert

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

Reading Norman Mailer's *The Deer Park* (375 pp., New York: Putnam, $4), I kept thinking, somewhat incongruously, of *The Kentons*, by William Dean Howells. The latter is a mild little novel, by no means Howells' best, in which the word "love" is first mentioned seriously as between man and woman on page 305. The Kentons were a Midwestern family who lived around the turn of the century, and the plot of the story hinges on the efforts of the old judge and his wife to get their oldest daughter away from the attentions of a boorish newspaperman who insists upon pursuing his prey to New York. The girl is flustered by the boor's attentions, drawn by the creature and repelled by him at the same moment, but all ends well with a therapeutic trip to Europe and the magical intervention of a shipboard love affair with a clergyman that proves to be the real thing.

The notable thing about Howells' inoffensive and even prudish little story is that it tells more, basically, about love than Mr. Mailer's long story of love among the cinema stars in Palm Springs, California—or Desert D'Or, as Mr. Mailer renames the place. What Howells captures is something that has to do with overtone, or aura, or ambiance—call it what you will. The *feelings* of love are in his story. Mailer, on the other hand, has written the true novel of the Kinseyan outlet. The machinery of sex—and I mean the machinery—is omnipresent in every page. Everybody sleeps with everybody else, and orgasms are as plentiful as blackberries. But nobody really cares for his partner of the month, the week or the moment, even though the to-do and the hoopla of mating is pretty terrific.

No doubt Mr. Mailer, if cornered, would seek refuge in the claim that he is taking Flaubert's advice to Maupassant about really looking at the horse. Mailer's face, as displayed on the back cover of the book jacket, is that of an intensely serious and sensitive observer of things-as-they-are. And, for all I know, this may be the way love, or sex, goes in Hollywood and its colonies out on the cactus desert. But if what Mailer is writing can even remotely be called the truth, his own attitude toward it betrays a woeful lack of values. He takes his people with the utmost seriousness as lovers. And at the same time he is almost totally inattentive to their troubles as human beings in the odd moments when they are not engaged in copulation.

Take his young air force lieutenant, for example. He is an orphan, and the sight of bruised and torn flesh in Korea has so revolted him that, for a period, he cannot look at the body of a girl with any desire. This, if it happened to any other young man in his early twenties, would be the cause of terrible emotional tumult. But with Mr. Mailer's implausible Sergius O'Shaugnessy it seems to be a mere minor interlude. The moment that Sergius catches a glimpse of the bright little pin-up face of Lulu Meyers, the trauma, or whatever the loss of sexual desire may be called, goes up in smoke.

The other major love affair in *The Deer Park* involves Charles Francis Eitel, a film director who is temporarily blackballed for his refusal to testify before a congressional committee, and an Italian flamenco dancer named Elena Esposito. Presumably Eitel has had a long period of political turmoil behind him when we first meet him. But Mailer skips rapidly over the political and the artistic involvements of Mr. Eitel in order to concentrate on his sexual proclivities and potentialities. Evidently Eitel has to prove himself in bed on a weekly average that makes Casanova look like a piker. His inamorata, the dancer, who has been the mistress of a producer, has a similar psychic affliction. Far from regarding Eitel as something of a one-sided character, however, Mr. Mailer seems to admire him inordinately.

The line that really gives the show away is Lulu Meyers' sudden announcement to Sergius O'Shaughnessy that she has been unfaithful to him by "sleeping" with a film actor in a telephone booth! That puts Mr. Mailer one up on the novelist who suggested a mating in the driver's seat of a Jaguar. But the author takes Lulu's confession with portentous seriousness; there is no suggestion of satire.

As for the pimps, call girls, marijuana smokers, dope-peddlers and pansies who are the supernumeraries of Mr. Mailer's fable, they are not presented with satirical overtones, either. They walk through Mr. Mailer's pages as natural phenomena. Maybe they are natural in the resort community of Desert D'Or. But if they are, it would seem to call for some auctorial recognition that the place is not exactly normal, or certainly not normative.

The Deer Park is a fictional result of the movement that has culminated in the two Kinsey Reports, which are based on a recognition of sex as a branch of statistics. The Kinsey approach may result in some truthful tabulations on a physiological level, but the art of tabulation is certainly not the art of drama. In saying this I don't think I am reacting in an unwarrantedly prudish way. If Mailer had employed the devices and the attitude of romantic irony in the manner of Arthur Schnitzler's boudoir playlets, he would have added to the gaiety of a nation and I would have applauded. If he had turned out some frank pornography in the manner of Frank Har-

ris' *My Life and Loves*, I would have taken it for mere outrageous boasting. But when Mr. Mailer writes about sex as if it were part food, part daily exercise, and part mere gratification of the will, a good deal of the truth about human beings simply evaporates. There is no sentiment here, no feeling of comradeship, no tenderness, no desire to give as well as to receive. Sex exists as a function; it does not rise to the quality of a relationship.

If Hollywood is indeed the community of Mr. Mailer's fictional imagining, then it calls for a supreme satirist. If it is not, it should take it upon itself to answer Mailer as a libel artist. For myself, I thank Mr. Mailer for sending me back to William Dean Howells.

Book-Burning Whitewash

Thaddeus Stevens: A Being Darkly Wise and Rudely Great, by Ralph Korngold. 460 pp. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company. $6.00

Mr. Ralph Korngold's frankly partisan biography of Thaddeus Stevens concentrates heavily upon the period from 1860 to 1868, when Stevens came into conflict with Lincoln and led the Radical faction of the Republican Party into a sweeping repudiation of Lincoln's "moderate" policy for reconstructing the defeated South. During the past two or three decades many distinguished historians and biographers of both North and South have combed over the same years. And the weight of their evidence, accepted by all but a few minor dissenters of the "revisionist" school, is that military reconstruction, with its attendant features, must be regarded as a blot upon American history.

Mr. Korngold does not think it a blot. He reverts to the Radical Republican view, which most recent historians have pictured as calamitous, and seeks to present it as highly patriotic, virtuous and practical. His purpose is, first, to explain Stevens' role during this critical period, but, second and much more important, to refute the adverse judgment that history has passed upon him.

It is difficult, of course, to make a hero out of a hard and bitter old political realist with as much of the fanatic in him as Stevens demonstrably had. Mr. Korngold's previous books on Robespierre, Saint-Just, Toussaint L'Ouverture, W. L. Garrison and Wendell Phillips seem, however, to have prepared him well for this extraordinary task, and he labors at it devotedly—the more devotedly, perhaps, because he joins the "revisionist" school of Reconstruction historians at the moment when, in the attempted instrumentation of the U. S. Supreme Court's decision on segregation, the South and the nation once more face the long-distance results of his protagonist's measures, including the Fourteenth Amendment, of which Stevens was actually the author.

The purely explanatory part of Mr. Korngold's extensive study is not without merit. In order to explain Stevens' opposition to Lincoln, Mr. Korngold must systematically remind us, for example, that Lincoln did not hold that the emancipated Negroes should be regarded as equals of the whites; that at first he favored emancipation only if it could be accompanied by colonization abroad; that he was a "gradualist" and thought slaveowners should be compensated for their loss; above all, as Mr. Korngold reproachfully points out, that he cunningly devised the Emancipation Proclamation so that it would not really emancipate, and was willing to readmit the Southern states to the Union without much delay even if it cost the Republicans control of Congress.

Mr. Korngold argues that Lincoln, as a politician, would not have followed this moderate policy through to its extreme consequences — that he would, rather, have swung around, had he lived, to something like Stevens' position. But this is mostly just speculation on Mr. Korngold's part. He glosses rather hastily over the fact that Lincoln was elected for his second term as the candidate of the National Union Convention, not of the Republican Party as such, and that his running mate was Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, a Union Democrat. And he is too busy imagining what Lincoln would have done and justifying Stevens' policy to do justice to Andrew Johnson, whom he presents, contrary to the judgment of most recent biographers, as merely an ignorant, stubborn "poor white" who was confused about everything.

This caricature of Johnson is typical of the many grotesque distortions to which Mr. Korngold must resort in his effort to make a far-seeing statesman out of Thad Stevens. Historians generally concede that Stevens was, true enough, a thoroughgoing political realist who rose to leadership because he had a drastic political solution for an urgent problem. The Radical Republicans, after the death of Lincoln, found themselves with a Democrat in the White House and a war-weary North at their backs. As a minority party, they had before them the certainty of political defeat if the Southern states were readmitted according to Lincoln's tentative plan. Mr. Korngold sees Stevens' solution—to treat the South as a "conquered province" —as actually moderate and reasonable in intent, and much more practical than any other policy, even from the Southern viewpoint. His thesis is that Stevens' policy was defeated by "the intransigence of the South, the legalism of conservative Republicans, and the obstructionist tactics of President Johnson."

The defect in this view is that Mr. Korngold, in order to urge it, must advance once more the romantic absurdity, long since exploded, that the South was composed of a simple social trinity consisting of a planter aristocracy (the "slaveocracy" of Abolitionist propaganda), a mass of "poor whites," and a mass of Negro slaves who would instantly achieve human perfection if emancipated and endowed by the government with "forty acres and a mule." He repeats the old myth that a small planter minority were somewhat mysteriously able to dominate the mass of "poor whites" who otherwise, he seems to assume, would have made common cause with the emancipated Negroes and Thad Stevens.

I do not know whether Mr. Korngold reverts to this no longer tenable view out of naiveté, or out of sheer determination to whitewash Thad Stevens, no matter how much book-burning may be necessary before the whitewash can be made really white. Certainly he has not the least idea of what a planter was or is, or a plantation.

His bibliography and footnotes most clearly reveal him, too, as favoring nineteenth-century rather than twentieth-century historical authorities. For example, he makes no

use of the works of U. B. Phillips, F. L. Owsley, Francis Simkins and others, which would alter his false conception of Southern society. He cites Susan Davis' meager little history of the Ku Klux Klan, but makes no reference to Stanley Horn's authoritative and definitive *Invisible Empire*. Apparently he has no acquaintance with Thomas B. Alexander's *Political Reconstruction in Tennessee*, the only thorough work on the subject. As a crowning absurdity, he labors awkwardly to confer the honors of statesmanship upon Ben Wade, Roscoe Conkling, and even Ben ("Spoons") Butler. Such defects give this massive and often interesting book the ghastly peculiarity of a historical waxworks.

DONALD DAVIDSON

Established Precedent

Advance to Barbarism, by F. J. P. Veale. 305 pp. New York: Devin-Adair Company. $4.50

The first half of the twentieth century has witnessed the development of a tremendously powerful assault on the standards of civilized life. Basic distinctions have been blurred, and the will to discriminate and so maintain the customs of civilized life has been destroyed.

Advance to Barbarism covers a crucial aspect of this development, namely, the policies of the leading Western powers during and after World War Two. But it draws upon the whole history of human warfare for background for its author's thesis that "the peoples of Europe, alone among the peoples of the earth . . . gradually . . . evolved a code of conduct governing the waging of warfare, a code of conduct which, most ancient and many modern authorities agree, is totally contrary to the whole spirit of war."

The code, Veale argues, distinguished sharply between combatants and non-combatants, so that "the sole business" of the combatants was to fight *each other*, and so exclude non-combatants from the scope of military operations. Its fundamental principle was that "hostilities between civilized peoples must be limited to the armed forces actually engaged."

Who, in Europe, first violated it in the civilized world? Veale replies that the "first great historic break with the European practices" took place "in the bloody American Civil War," when the Northern or Federal armies resorted to "primary or total warfare." And that in World War Two both the Americans and the Eurasians of the Soviet Union showed utter disregard for "what Europeans of past generations had [considered] permissible in warfare."

Veale cites numerous serious violations of the code during World War Two. But he devotes primary attention to the bombing of population centers beyond the scope of other military operations and to the war crimes trials—and, with respect to the former, carefully canvasses the question, Who started it? Veale believes an authoritative answer to the latter question is to be found in *Bombing Vindicated*, J. M. Spaight's book, published in 1941. Writes Mr. Spaight, who was a member of the staff of the British Air Ministry at the time the bombing started:

> Because we were doubtful about the psychological effect of propagandist distortion of the truth that it was we who started the strategic bombing offensive, we have shrunk from giving our great decision of May 11th, 1940, the publicity which it deserved. That, surely, was a mistake. It was a splendid decision. It was as heroic, as self-sacrificing, as Russia's decision to adopt her policy of 'scorched earth.' It gave Coventry and Birmingham, Sheffield and Southampton the right to look Kiev and Kharkov, Stalingrad and Sebastopol in the face. Our Soviet Allies would have been less critical of our inactivity in 1942 if they had understood what we had done.

"The stock apology" for the policy of strategic bombing has always been, of course, that it was "reprisal for the German bombing of Warsaw and Rotterdam." But Spaight, as we see him through Veale's quotation, takes another view: "When Warsaw and Rotterdam were bombed, German armies were at their gates. The air bombardment was an operation of the tactical offensive." Veale also quotes Liddell Hart: "Bombing did not take place until the German troops were fighting their way into these cities and thus conformed to the old rules of siege bombardment."

Veale is able to nail down the matter of the war crimes trials in much the same way. For here he can cite Field Marshal Montgomery:

"The Nürnberg trials have made the waging of unsuccessful war a crime: the generals on the defeated side are tried and hanged."

In summary, we may say that while the Nazis were appallingly barbarous in their assault on civilization, they were comparatively unskilled and did not succeed in destroying any of the distinctions on which civilized life depends. Their treatment of certain reaches of their own population was, indeed, horrible, but there was never any danger of its being regarded as an example for the civilized world to follow. With the precedents established by the British and the Americans it is quite otherwise: in case of another world war, we shall find it difficult, if not impossible, to avoid following them.

WILLIAM T. COUCH

Simple Testimony

Hitler, by Otto Dietrich. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. 277 pp. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. $3.95

The current rash of anti-Nazi books, movies, plays, and radio and TV programs is motivated neither by sweet chance nor by stray fate. In some cases, the purpose is to discourage the resurgence of free Germany as Europe's dominant nation and chief bulwark against Soviet aggression. In others, the purpose is to discredit overenergetic anti-communism (Hitler, we are reminded, used anti-communism to help *him* gain power). The most sophisticated of such works follow their "Boo! The Nazis will get you if you don't watch out," by the supposed clincher that, after all, Nazism and communism boil down to one and

To order any book reviewed in this book section, write:
THE BOOKMAILER
Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N. Y.
Return mail service—postpaid
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

$.....payment enclosed
Please send me: ..... (name of book)
.....
.....
Name .....
Address .....
.....
(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment MUST accompany order. N.Y. City residents add 3% tax.)

the same thing. There was never a greater over-simplification.

One virtue of this otherwise thin "how I grew to hate Hitler" recital by the late Otto Dietrich is that it convincingly reminds us of facts that we are too frequently asked to forget: that Nazism was a national not an international movement, and that it was the political child of one man's incredible personality, not the revolutionary culmination of a system of philosophy. I say "convincing" because of the author. One has the feeling that if he could have produced any broader tirade against Hitler, he would surely have done so. Yet he takes his former boss (he was Hitler's press relations chief from 1933 to 1945) to task exclusively on the national level, and this despite the fact that he (Dietrich) was a confirmed socialist and internationalist, interested much more in a "community" of Europe than a German conquest of it. Though he disagreed with Hitler, he was fired from his job only after a particularly sharp issue arose in 1945. Dissenters in an anti-Nazi nation like the Soviet Union find themselves out of office quicker than that, and do not survive ten years to write a book about the boss.

Dietrich's story runs as follows: Hitler did win the hearts of the German people, partly by ending unemployment, partly by holding forth to German populations split away by World War One the prospect of returning to the fatherland, and partly by giving all Germans hope of working—not fighting—out of the pit into which, punitively, they had been cast after 1918. Even Hitler's racial policies —beginning with his attack on Jewish financial concentrations—were popular and moderate at first. However, Hitler's own wild passions—"pathological restlessness," "megalomania," "hysterical rage," and "intellectual arrogance"—twisted and distorted the pattern. Dietrich himself, for example, became disenchanted when he realized, after the Western powers had refused Hitler's one sincere "peace in our time" offer following the Polish invasion, that Hitler was thinking only of war. But neither he nor anyone else could do anything about ousting Hitler, because Germany was by now like a train driven by a mad engineer—a mad engineer, however, who had proven his skill all along, "and assured everybody he would bring the train to its destination." Who, Dietrich asks, could take upon himself in such a situation the tremendous responsibility of depriving the train of its driver, thereby certainly endangering the lives of all?

Dietrich has some important things to say about Hitler's—and Nazism's—ultimate goals.

> It has been said [he writes] that Hitler strove to dominate the world. I do not believe that his goal was unlimited, for all of the elementary force of his will to power. How could a man . . . who was not even ambitious for colonies, who altogether lacked anything resembling a cosmopolitan horizon—how could such a man conquer a world of which he had no conception? His field of vision was too narrow for such a goal. More within his mental sphere was the concept of an imperial Germany as the supreme arbiter in Europe. He did not want to be the creator of a new Europe in an age of united nations; rather his dream was to be master of an old, isolated, conservative Continent.

This simple testimony to a simple and obvious fact of history will, of course, be totally ignored by the men and women who produce, and will keep on producing, the plays, papers, books and broadcasts in which, as in the late Robert Sherwood's recently revived "There Shall Be No Night," Communists are subordinate heavies while Nazis and fascists "are the real enemy." KARL HESS

Episodic Chapters

New Found World, by Harold Lamb. 336 pp. New York: Doubleday and Company. $5.75

This series of episodic chapters about the discoverers and first explorers of the Western Hemisphere is as interesting and as informative as a series of picture postcards sent back by some traveler abroad. With its emphasis on the picturesque and superficial, it is designed, perhaps, for the type of reader who has yet to be told that educated men in the fifteenth century did not believe that the world was flat. The book is, for the most part, written in English, but connoisseurs of blatant barbarisms may enjoy collecting and translating such specimens as "to mass-slay" (i.e., massacre), "food lacked" (there was not enough food) and "to decimate" (destroy). R. P. O.

To the Editor

I have just finished reading the first issue of NATIONAL REVIEW and I hasten to offer my most sincere congratulations. This is one of the most literate publications it has been my pleasure to read. The point of view expressed throughout articulates the feelings of a great number of Americans with wit and clarity. We have needed such a publication for a long time.

New York City MARVIN LIEBMAN

NATIONAL REVIEW arrived yesterday. It was a very exciting event! The format is tip-top. It attracts the eye and lures one on to peruse the contents.

In "The Magazine's Credenda," paragraph A is magnificent. It sets the standard for the future course of NATIONAL REVIEW—the course that must be followed strictly if the U.S.A. is to be saved from the dictatorship of the Communists or the Fascist-Nazi factions.

So here's wishing NATIONAL REVIEW every possible success!

Wayne, Pa. ELLEN WINSOR

Generally speaking, I would say that your magazine does not read easily. Come down to earth and let a word be a word—don't torment it. . . . In spite of your emphasis and explanation of the word "liberal," I find your usage of it confusing. Why not the clear distinction of "phoney" or "fictitious" before the word?

New York City MARGARET WELLS FULLER

This morning I received the first edition of NATIONAL REVIEW, which I read from cover to cover. I hasten to offer my congratulations to all that made it possible. . . .

New York City S. H. BENSON

Please accept my congratulations on your first issue. If you maintain the high quality of style and good sense which this issue symbolized, then a great new force for intelligent Americanism will have been born. The need for an organ of conservative opinion has never been greater, since both of our major parties have strong elements within them which tend toward more and bigger government.

New York City CHARLES H. DOCKENDORFF

You'll always look your well-groomed best

in suits and slacks of

Milliken's Visa TROPICAL

(the original, *proven* 55% Dacron* —45% worsted blend)

- **Shrugs off wrinkles**
- **Skips pressings**
- **Holds trouser crease — *even in the rain***

Neatest! Coolest! Smartest! Milliken's VISA is the first and best Dacron-Worsted blend. Proven over five summers, Visa is tailored in America's leading brands of men's lightweight suits and slacks. In elegant, year-round Lord West tuxedoes too. Ask for Milliken's VISA by name at your favorite men's store.

For the store nearest you, write:

Milliken Woolens, Inc. Men's Wear Division, 1407 Broadway, New York 18, N. Y.

**DuPont's polyester fiber*